



FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

JPRS Report

Near East & South Asia

KASHMIR

Near East & South Asia

KASHMIR

JPRS-NEA-93-115

CONTENTS

16 December 1993

PAKISTANI VIEWS

Kashmir Said Certain To Become Part of Pakistan	<i>[NAWA-I-WAQT 13 Sep]</i>	1
Kashmiri Leader's Visit to U. S. Viewed	<i>[JANG 25 Sep]</i>	1
Editorials Suspicious of U. S. Interest in Kashmir		3
U. S. Seeking Foothold	<i>[NAWA-I-WAQT 29 Sep]</i>	3
Need for Caution	<i>[JANG 30 Sep]</i>	4
International Conspiracy To Divide Kashmir Claimed	<i>[AKHBAR-E-JEHAN 3 Oct]</i>	4
Indian Proposal on Kashmir Viewed	<i>[JANG 21 Oct]</i>	6
Editorial Condemns Indian 'Repression' at Hazrat Bal	<i>[THE NATION 23 Oct]</i>	6
Prospect of Political Changes in Free Kashmir	<i>[AKHBAR-E-JEHAN 24 Oct]</i>	7
Paper Accuses India of 'Ethnic Cleansing' in Kashmir	<i>[THE PAKISTAN TIMES 24 Oct]</i>	8
Paper Urges 'Meaningful' Dialogue With India	<i>[PAKISTAN 28 Oct]</i>	9
Kashmiri Senator Calls for Jihad Against India	<i>[THE PAKISTAN OBSERVER 29 Oct]</i>	9
U.S. Official's Statement on Kashmir Criticized	<i>[MASHRIQ 1 Nov]</i>	10
Daily Notes Indian Preparations To Attack Azad Kashmir	<i>[NAWA-I-WAQT 1 Nov]</i>	11
Commentary Points to U.S., European 'Plans' on Kashmir	<i>[KHABRAIN 2 Nov]</i>	11
Editorial Urges Peaceful Solution to Kashmir Problems	<i>[PAKISTAN 3 Nov]</i>	12
Editorial Criticizes Indian Actions in Kashmir	<i>[THE PAKISTAN TIMES 5 Nov]</i>	12
Commentary Lauds 'U.S. Appreciation' of Kashmir Viewpoint	<i>[Islamabad Radio 10 Nov]</i>	13
Editorial Opposes Nonmilitary Zone Status for Siachen	<i>[NAWA-I-WAQT 11 Nov]</i>	14
Editorial Stresses Need To Counter Indian 'Propaganda'	<i>[NAWA-I-WAQT 15 Nov]</i>	14
Commentary Urges Improved Atmosphere for Kashmir Talks	<i>[Islamabad Radio 17 Nov]</i>	14
Urdu Daily Rejects Hurd's Proposals on Kashmir	<i>[NAWA-I-WAQT 17 Nov]</i>	15
Commentary Previews Talks With India on Kashmir Issue	<i>[Islamabad Radio 26 Nov]</i>	16
Editorial Praises Return to Talks With India	<i>[THE NEWS 26 Nov]</i>	16
Editorial Sees 'Promise' for Outcome of Talks With India	<i>[DAWN 26 Nov]</i>	17

INDIAN VIEWS

Article Exposes 'Myths' About Kashmir	<i>[INDIAN EXPRESS 27 Oct]</i>	19
Editorial Urges Government To 'Expose' Pakistani 'Designs'	<i>[NAV BHARAT TIMES 27 Oct]</i>	20
Former Governor Cautions U.S. Over Kashmir Policy	<i>[INDIAN EXPRESS 30 Oct]</i>	20
Article Assails U.S. India Policy	<i>[INDIAN EXPRESS 31 Oct]</i>	21
Editorial Criticizes U.S. Policy on Kashmir	<i>[ANANDABAZAR PATRIKA 1 Nov]</i>	22
U.S. Thinking on Kashmir Term 'Scandalously Shocking'	<i>[INDIAN EXPRESS 1 Nov]</i>	23
Government Urged To Resist U.S. 'Pressure' Over Kashmir	<i>[INDIAN EXPRESS 9 Nov]</i>	23
Kashmir Turmoil, Alienation Attributed to Government Policy		24
Government Indecisive	<i>[JANSATTA 9-10 Nov]</i>	24
Weakness Allowing Foreign Interference	<i>[AJ 9 Nov]</i>	27
U.S. Policy Unhelpful	<i>[AJ 9 Nov]</i>	28
Crisis Deepening	<i>[AJ 4 Nov]</i>	29
U.S., Pakistan Aggravating Situation	<i>[AJ 4 Nov]</i>	29
Constitutional Crisis	<i>[AJ 1 Nov]</i>	31
Government's Kashmir Policy Seen Inept, Failing	<i>[ANANDABAZAR PATRIKA 13 Nov]</i>	32
White House Urged To Take 'a Different View' on Kashmir	<i>[Delhi Radio 19 Nov]</i>	33
Hazratbal Occupation's Impact on Kashmir Analyzed	<i>[NAV BHARAT TIMES 22 Nov]</i>	34
Paper Notes OIC 'Lack of Support' for Pakistan Move	<i>[INDIAN EXPRESS 25 Nov]</i>	34
U.S. Position on Kashmir Questioned	<i>[JANSATTA 25 Nov]</i>	35
British Position on Kashmir Seen More Favorable Than U.S.	<i>[JANSATTA 26 Nov]</i>	35

Kashmir Said Certain To Become Part of Pakistan

94AS0050B Lahore NAWA-I-WAQT in Urdu 13 Sep 93 p 10

[Editorial: "Kashmir Will Become Pakistan: Remain Steadfast on Principle."]

[Text] Sardar Abdul Qayum Khan, prime minister of Azad Kashmir, spoke at the National Press Club in Washington D.C. and said that Pakistan and India had agreed at the UN level to solve the Kashmir issue by means of a referendum. However, while staying within the jurisdiction of the UN, the establishment of an independent Kashmir could be considered. At the present time, the [Kashmiris] wanted a referendum to be held in Kashmir in accordance with the agreement reached among Pakistan, India and the UN in order to vote for independence or annexation with India or Pakistan. Sardar Qayum regards himself as the first mujahid of Kashmir and the stationary of his party and government carries the slogan, Kashmir will become Pakistan. Sardar Qayum knows that the agenda for the freedom and division of the subcontinent does not recognize any independent status for a state or territory outside of India or Pakistan nor do the UN resolutions imply in any way that the people of Kashmir can choose an option other than annexation with India or Pakistan. The date of the independence of the subcontinent is not so distant that the facts have been forgotten nor is there any ambiguity in the UN resolutions which would allow various interpretations. Even if one should accept that all these events have become old, the fact remains that the way in which the Muslim men and women, the old and the young of the Kashmir valley have been fighting a jihad against India and sacrificing their lives for the last 4 or 5 years; the way in which they wave Pakistan's green crescent flag from their rooftops and shout Long Live Pakistan should leave no doubt in anyone's mind as to what the Muslims of the valley want. Indeed, the talk of a third option or independent Kashmir by certain Kashmiri and Pakistani leaders is the result of the pressure exerted by the new world order. Our leaders are diverging from the historical stand of Pakistan and the Kashmiris out of fear of the sole superpower, the U.S. While prime minister, Nawaz Sharif also made the mistake of talking about the third option and recently, Sardar Qayum has supported such an option. In his U.S. visit, caretaker prime minister Moin Qureshi said that Pakistan's stand was to give the Kashmiris the right to referendum within the jurisdiction of the UN but that a third option as well could be considered.

The fact is that whenever a leader or an individual in office has talked of a third option, the people of Pakistan and Kashmiri Muslims have launched such strong protests that the individual has been forced to abandon the third option and support instead Pakistan's national stand. Since the assumption of office by the caretaker government, rumors have been flying around with greater frequency that looting of Kashmir will take place similar

to that of Palestine and America wants to force the acceptance of its solution. Although caretaker prime minister Moin Qureshi has denied these rumors, the fact remains that in view of the way in which the U.S. treated the issue of Palestine and Jerusalem, it is quite possible that it will enforce its will to end the Kashmir issue. Recently, Pakistan's foreign secretary took part in high level talks on Kashmir and the nuclear program in the capitals of Finland and Holland. In the press reports on the matter, the question was raised as to whether the U.S. intended to have its plan forcibly accepted in the name of peace. We have always emphasized in our columns that from the geographical, cultural, economic and in short every aspect, Kashmir is an inseparable part of Pakistan.

Without Kashmir, the agenda for the establishment of Pakistan remains unfinished and Pakistan could encounter serious difficulties in defense and economics. Qaid-I-Azam called Kashmir Pakistan's main artery and from the point of view of Pakistan's water sources, Kashmir is indeed its main artery. Kashmiri Muslims are making historical sacrifices in order to join Pakistan. To accept a second or third solution to the Kashmir problem is tantamount to placing Pakistan's defense and economic needs in jeopardy. May God forbid that the powerful personalities of Azad Kashmir or Pakistan or national leaders adopt a way of thinking which should result in Pakistan losing Kashmir and cause Pakistan's borders to shrink to Thalkot and the GT road [not far from Islamabad]. To accept an independent Kashmir is to prove traitor to the blood of the Kashmiris. The government of Pakistan, the Azad Kashmir government and national and political leaders should stand adamant on the national consensus that Kashmir should become a part of Pakistan and the only route to that is through a free referendum. Those of our leaders who show weakness or cowardice before the new world order should remember the fates of Jaafar, Sadiq and Sheikh Abdullah. No honorable nation gives free rein to its traitors.

Kashmiri Leader's Visit to U. S. Viewed

94AS0052C Karachi JANG in Urdu 25 Sep 93 p 3

[Article by Nayer Zaidi: "Sardar Abdul Qayum's Visit to the U. S."]

[Text] Sardar Abdul Qayum Khan, prime minister of Azad Kashmir and Jammu, warned in an interview that violence and oppression had increased to such an extent in occupied Kashmir that the outbreak of a nuclear war was a possibility. He made this statement to the representative of the WASHINGTON TIMES and his statement was quoted directly in the publication. Earlier, in a conversation on 10 September with Pakistani and Indian journalists, he warned of the possibility of a war between Pakistan and India.

Sardar Qayum is an independent man politically and can say anything he wishes; however, one would have expected that before his trip to the U. S. he would have

consulted with the Pakistani foreign ministry and reached an agreement over what he would say in regard to certain topics and how he would say it.

The question then is, is it Pakistan's policy or in Pakistan's interests to convey the impression that there is real danger of a war between Pakistan and India and that if such a war does break out, nuclear weapons would be used.

The main objection the U. S. has raised against Pakistan's nuclear program is that if Pakistan had any nuclear weapons and a war should break out, Pakistan would use these weapons against India. Hence, on a regional basis, South Asia has been placed at the top of the list of places where a nuclear war might erupt. Recently, an article was published by Seymour Hirsch in the NEW YORKER magazine in which he claimed that a nuclear war between India and Pakistan was imminent in 1990 but that timely intervention by the U. S. prevented it. Pakistan's chief of army staff, General Mirza Aslam Beg was in Washington at that time. Although his visit was non-official, he was asked to speak in various places. He was asked this question [possibility of Indo-Pakistan war in 1990] on several occasions and at a luncheon where he was to speak, Hirsch was also invited. On more than one occasion, General Beg denied that Pakistan and India were close to war or that nuclear weapons would have been used if war had erupted. His view was that propaganda was being carried out to convince people that Pakistan and other developing countries were so irresponsible that they would use their nuclear weapons without hesitation and at the first opportunity. The news [of imminent war] first surfaced when Robert Gates visited Pakistan and India and the source of the news was American. Gates was at that time security advisor to the White House and later became the director of the CIA. He might have claimed the existence of a grave danger to increase his own importance and to take credit for ending the danger. Every bureaucrat wants his visit to appear "important" and "successful."

I do not know what really happened in 1990; General Aslam Beg is of course better informed; but from the point of view of public policy, I agree with his view that Pakistan should not convey the impression that it would use nuclear weapons irresponsibly. In a moment of great anxiety, the president of Bosnia is believed to have said that he would somehow obtain nuclear weapons and use them to defend [his people]. It would be foolish to take such a statement seriously but in his television appearance, the U.S. secretary of state immediately seized upon this statement to show that if small countries had nuclear weapons, they would use them unhesitatingly.

It is therefore hard to understand whether Sardar Qayum's statement here was part of policy or whether he unknowingly said things which could harm not only his position but that of Pakistan as well.

Another thing one cannot understand is why an offer was made to negotiate over Kashmir. Qayum had suggested

that Kashmiris on both sides of the control line should start talks among themselves under the supervision of the U. S. and Britain. He also said that in his talks with congressman Stephen Solarz on the subject, the latter had wondered about the possibility that (the representatives of Azad and occupied Kashmir) might agree on a resolution supporting the right to self-determination. Sardar Qayum (National Press Club, 10 September) assured Solarz, "We are not such fools."

What would be the object of these talks and if such talks or any talks are started, how would the movement [for freedom] be affected? Pundit Nehru had promised to hold talks and so had John Kennedy and at the latter's suggestion, negotiations were held but India's position did not change. During its war with China, India was concerned that Pakistan might seize Kashmir; hence, the "bait" of negotiations was offered. But, before supporting such talks, Pakistani leaders did not ask the U.S. what action it would take against India if such talks failed. [They could have said] that Pakistan would take over Kashmir by force and negotiate as soon as the war ended; what would have been the difference? Talks were talks anyway and what difference would it have made whether Pakistan had all of Kashmir or one third of it? [They could have said] that after taking over Kashmir, Pakistan would hold a referendum there under the supervision of the UN, U. S., Britain and India as well. Lord Mountbatten had written in 1947 to the British sovereign that Kashmir may have been handed over to India but one day it would join Pakistan. John Kennedy and Pundit Nehru both knew that if a referendum was held, the majority of the Kashmiris would opt for Pakistan; that was why Mountbatten did not commit "the folly" of holding a referendum. One can understand why John Kennedy and Pundit Nehru avoided this "folly" as well but what was the point of Azad Kashmir's premier assuring Solarz that if Kashmiris from both sides got together, they would not be foolish enough to approve a resolution for a referendum? Why is there a need for referendum anyway? If the Kashmiris had accepted annexation to India, why would they have taken up arms against that country? It is obvious that they do not want to stay with India. A referendum would officially confirm their feelings. However, if Kashmir's fate is decided at a table through negotiations where instead of the people, the so called leaders would be voting, then undoubtedly these leaders would not commit the "folly" of a referendum because the people of Kashmir would vote for annexation with Pakistan whereas the "leaders" would want to compromise over an independent Kashmir.

Replying to an Indian journalist's question, Sardar Qayum said that article 370 of the Indian constitution which gave a special status to Kashmir in the federation had been revoked [as published]. Then he added that if this article had not been revoked, India might have had a case. As I remember it, even when this article was part of the Indian constitution, Pakistan never accepted it as proving in any way that India had "a case."

Sardar Qayum arrived at the wrong time as well. Maybe there were reasons which the writer cannot fathom, but from September 10 to 13, the Middle East drama was being played here. I do not think that [Qayum] held any important meetings. He did meet Kashmiris and Pakistanis which was well and good, but to come to U.S. just to meet them makes no sense.

Firstly, prime minister Moin Qureshi said in Washington that Pakistan's attitude was flexible. When objections were raised over this statement, it was denied. Then a senior official of the foreign ministry said that the discussion over Kashmir's status was "premature." Since he spoke off the record, his name cannot be mentioned. It is interesting to note that Sardar Qayum has appointed a senior Pakistani journalist here to propagate Kashmir's cause. When "the premature" statement was being discussed, this journalist volunteered the statement that Abdul Ghani Lone of occupied Kashmir was saying the same thing. But according to our information, Lone is an Indian infiltrator in the movement and had come to the U. S. at India's behest. An agreement of opinion between Lone and a high official of Pakistan's foreign ministry? As the saying goes, here comes another adversity; and now after listening to Sardar Qayum, we will have to say, here is misfortune for the third time.

Editorials Suspicious of U. S. Interest in Kashmir

U. S. Seeking Foothold

94AS0051A Lahore NAWA-I-WAQT in Urdu 29 Sep 93
p 4

[Editorial: "The Kashmir Issue: What Lies Behind U. S. Favors."]

[Text] In his first address to the UN General Assembly recently, President Clinton drew world attention to the conflict in Jammu and Kashmir and said that in those areas as well, the people of Kashmir were struggling to gain freedom. Meanwhile, the Hong Kong weekly ASIA WEEK has revealed that following the agreement between Israel and the PLO, international efforts were in progress to bring about a quick resolution of the Kashmir problem by means of a compromise between Pakistan and India and to this end, preliminary talks through a third party had taken place in Washington recently between Pakistan's foreign secretary Shaharyar Khan and India's foreign secretary J. N. Dixit. The reference to the Kashmir problem in the address to the General Assembly by the head of the sole superpower is at any rate important; moreover, this event confirms the reports in the international media of communications which appear from time to time in regard to the search for a solution of the Kashmir problem similar to the solution of the Palestine issue. A few years ago, a number of U.S. senators and members of the House of Representatives toured India and Pakistan and tried to push

forward their view that in order to end the tense situation, both India and Pakistan should agree to the division of Kashmir. At the same time, certain Kashmiri leaders raised the slogan of an independent Kashmir. Various parties suggested to Pakistan and the mujahideen that they should accept India's right to Jammu and Ladakh so that the question of giving an independent status to the valley may be negotiated; but the mujahideen active in occupied Kashmir refused even to hear any such proposals. Obviously, Pakistan cannot entertain any proposals which are refused by the mujahideen and the people of Kashmir.

The Kashmir issue is part and parcel of the agenda for the division of the subcontinent according to which the people of Kashmir have the right to decide their own future. The UN as well agreed later to these resolutions and passed two resolutions of its own under which the people of Kashmir would be asked to decide by means of a referendum as to which of the two countries, Pakistan or India, they wished to join. There is no mention of a third option in either the agenda for the division of the subcontinent or the UN resolutions. Moreover, in the last 45 years, the people of Kashmir have never mentioned a third option nor are they willing to think of such an option. The struggle of the Kashmiris is aimed toward annexation with Pakistan and India is well aware of it. If India thought for a moment that the people of Kashmir would be willing to consider any option other than that of joining Pakistan, it would not waste another moment and agree to a referendum, thus freeing itself from this quagmire. But the people of Kashmir have always shouted long live Pakistan; even in cricket matches, they have prayed for the victory of the Pakistani team and waved Pakistan's flag to express their wishes. In view of this situation, India would like to thrust on us, by means of the U.S., the same kind of solution which the sole superpower has forced on the Palestinians. However, the U.S. should keep this fact in mind that there is such a clear, fundamental difference between the Palestinian problem and the Kashmir issue that to ignore it would be an obvious fraud. The formula for the division of the subcontinent and the UN resolutions give the people of Kashmir the right to decide their future through a referendum and the U.S. has supported these resolutions.

In a way, the Kashmir issue is similar to the Kuwait-Iraq war because India also occupied Kashmir without any justification at a time when the people of Kashmir were busy struggling against the Dogra regime. India felt certain that having put an end to the Dogra regime, the people of Kashmir would establish their own government which would then decide to join Pakistan. For the last 45 years, India has used every kind of weapon to subdue the people of Kashmir, from inducement to oppression and cruelty and has failed in its objective. Now it is sitting on America's lap and trying a new fraud: arbitration. We should approach any negotiations very carefully for the arbitrator itself may be arranging the whole drama in order to save India from a quagmire. We

were deceived in the Geneva negotiations when the U. S. made us agree to an honorable withdraw by Russia but the U. S. neither felt any responsibility to establish peace in Afghanistan nor did it force the Soviet Union to fulfill its part of the agreement. Now that the U. S. has finished its task in the Middle East, it has turned its attention to Kashmir. If President Clinton is aware of the struggle of the people of Kashmir to which he has referred in his important speech, he should not rely solely on the information supplied by India and the Indian lobby but keep in view the stand of the people of Kashmir. If we act hastily and, merely for the sake of getting rid of the Kashmir problem, should agree to the option of an independent Kashmir, we would be buying fresh trouble.

As a matter of principle, the whole of Kashmir should be given freedom as a single unit and allowed to join Pakistan because Jammu was never a Hindu majority area. If India's right to Ladakh and Jammu were to be accepted and the Indian and American formula of giving independence to the valley agreed to, then God forbid, a center for conspiracies against Pakistan and China would be established which would be very difficult to deal with, especially since there is no national unity [in Pakistan?] and we are beset with dissension. We should not rejoice to hear the American president mention the Kashmir issue in his speech but keeping in mind the report in ASIA WEEK, adopt a firm stand to defeat the conspiracies of the U.S. and India.

Need for Caution

94AS0051B Karachi JANG in Urdu 30 Sep 93 p 3

[Editorial: "American Interest in the Kashmir Issue: Need for Caution."]

[Text] The UN and the U. S. have recently been showing heightened interest in the Kashmir issue and, after two decades, Kashmir is being mentioned in the world organization. For the first time in history, an American president has spoken about the Kashmir issue on the UN platform in terms which have been considered favorable toward Pakistan and cause for worry for India. This is a hopeful situation for us and the Kashmiris but, at the same time, reports are in circulation which suggest that the U. S. is considering a solution for Kashmir which is different from the UN resolutions. Pakistan's position is clear; India agreed and announced its intention to hold a referendum in the entire province of Jammu and Kashmir and UN resolutions also support this form of solution to the Kashmir problem. Pakistan can agree to a solution which is in accordance with the resolutions and Pakistan expects as well that those powers who support self determination, justice and law will also support such a solution. However, Pakistan should pay attention to the hidden factors behind a recent statement by a spokesman for the U.S. department of state. The spokesman said that for a long time, Kashmir has remained a potentially explosive issue which, for various reasons, remained unsolved; but that a solution to the problem would be forthcoming in a matter of weeks. The

spokesman further explained that President Clinton had played an important part in resolving the Palestinian problem and that he was proceeding in the same spirit to find a solution to the Kashmir issue; that President Clinton wished to find a solution that would be acceptable to all three parties. High placed UN and U.S. officials told the International Press Service that with the help of the UN, the U.S. was preparing the draft of a proposal for the permanent solution of the Kashmir issue and that copies of the draft would be given to the interested parties for their comments and revisions. According to the IPS, at the present time, two formulas are under consideration; one proposes giving a permanent status to the present line of control between the two parts of Kashmir and making it the border between the two sections. Each part would be an independent state and UN troops would be stationed in the area until the two states gained strength and became less dependent on India and Pakistan. The second formula proposes joining the two parts, restoring the state to its 1947 status and making Kashmir an independent state. Clearly, Pakistan cannot accept either of these formulas which it considers against the interests and desires of the people of Kashmir and an act of treachery. The government of Pakistan should under no circumstances allow itself to fall into the trap of these so-called proposals and should maintain its traditional stand based on principle. The struggle of Kashmir's freedom lovers has breathed new life in the Kashmir issue and forced the world to pay attention to it and their struggle will finally produce a just solution. The statement of the U.S. Department of State that the Kashmir issue will be solved in a matter of weeks is surprising. The caretaker government should be wary and refrain from making any commitments. Any solution different from Pakistan's stand on principle should be ignored and the entire matter should be left to the newly elected government which will be answerable to the people.

International Conspiracy To Divide Kashmir Claimed

94AS0069D Karachi AKHBAR-E-JEHAN in Urdu
3 Oct 93 p 13

[Article by Khaja Abdul Rashid: "Are International Forces Trying To Carry Out the Division of Kashmir?"]

[Text] According to reports received from occupied Kashmir, occupying Indian troops have heightened their atrocities against the innocent men, women and children of Kashmir. But, at the same time, Kashmiri mujahideen also have intensified their activity and are attacking Indian troops with greater frequency and killing more Indian soldiers. India has intensified its efforts on various fronts in order to crush the Kashmiri freedom movement. Sayed Salahuddin, the supreme commander of Hezb-ul-Mujahedeen, an effective military organization within occupied Kashmir, said recently in a press interview that Kashmiri mujahideen had inflicted a total psychological defeat on the 500,000 Indian troops in occupied Kashmir; dozens of Indian army officials had

lost their mental balance and more than 200 Indian soldiers had crossed over with their weapons to the mujahedeen side; that the majority of Indian soldiers used heroin, marijuana and other narcotics on a large scale and several Indian soldiers, tired of the conditions, had shot their senior officers to death; Indian troops were so scared that they trembled when the mujahedeen were mentioned; in several places, the mujahedeen had made it impossible for the Indian soldiers to emerge from their hiding places; every Kashmiri house had become a fortress against India and small children shouted anti-Indian slogans at Indian soldiers and demonstrated their hatred for India. Sayed Salahuddin demanded that India end its terrorism in occupied Kashmir and give the Kashmiris the right of self determination. He made it clear that a solution which was unjust and against the wishes of the Kashmiris could not be imposed upon them; that no one would be allowed in Kashmir to become a Yasser Arafat; no one would be allowed to betray the huge sacrifices made by the Kashmiris; that no leadership could be imposed on the Kashmiris from outside; Kashmir's leaders were the individuals who had spent their lives in jail for the sake of Islam and freedom and they would not pay attention now to these restrictions [sic]. Salahuddin's views help one understand the situation in occupied Kashmir. At the present time, one of the topics under discussion in Kashmiri circles is that an effort would be made to solve the Kashmir problem while the caretaker government is in office. One view holds that at the U.S. behest, some kind of plan to divide Kashmir into three parts is under consideration. The plan proposes that Pakistan be given Azad Kashmir, Gilgit and Baltistan, and Jammu and Ladakh be annexed to India while the valley of Kashmir is made into an independent state. Reportedly, U.S. embassy officials are busily working on this plan or a similar one. U.S. army senior officer, General Howder's recent trip to Pakistan is being regarded as a link in this chain of activity. A responsible individual has expressed the view that General Howder's trip was in reality a geographical study of the area. Kashmiri circles are of the view that following the solution of the Palestine problem, the U. S. wants to solve the Kashmir issue as well and the formula being followed is the same kind of division adopted for Palestine and Bosnia. It is being said that preparations are under way to implement the proposal while the caretaker government is in office because later on, the assumption of office by a political government would create obstacles in the implementation of the plan. The caretaker prime minister, Moi-nuddin Qureishi, has openly declared in a statement that the government of Pakistan would not support the solution of the Kashmir issue on the lines of the Israel-Palestine agreement but his statement has not removed the doubts and suspicions of the people. Most political parties connected with Kashmir's freedom [movement] have already started their opposition to any such solutions. The Liberation Front has said that the Kashmiris would fully resist any attempt to impose any formula for the division of Kashmir. Sardar Sikander Hayat Khan, head of Azad Kashmir, has also said that the Kashmiris

would not accept any third option or any solution other than the one envisaged in the UN resolutions because any deviation from the stand for annexation with Pakistan would severely harm the freedom movement. Addressing two large public gatherings in occupied Kashmir's Jama Masjid [mosque] in Srinagar and Dargah Hazratbal [saint's shrine], the political leaders of occupied Kashmir have also said that any solution contrary to the wishes of the people of Kashmir would be unacceptable and that [the people of Kashmir] would not hesitate to shed the last drop of their blood in order to carry the freedom movement to its logical end. Amanullah Khan, chairman of the Liberation Front, has said that the people of Kashmir would not accept a solution which did not represent their national wishes and aspirations. The statements of these [Kashmiri] leaders show that they also are apprehensive that something is secretly being cooked up to solve the Kashmir issue. Azad Kashmir's president and prime minister may be unaware of these secret attempts but their silence is rousing even greater fears. However, most people are of the view that these two leaders are being kept in the dark about the real situation. Azad Kashmir's political circles are of the view that the coming weeks would prove very important and unusual events would be forthcoming. As for the reported plan to divide the Jammu and Kashmir province into three parts, this plan is not new and similar ones have been suggested off and on over the years in Pakistan and Azad Kashmir as well as India and occupied Kashmir. About a year ago, a Jammu newspaper published with a great flourish a suggestion by a Hindu leader that areas of Jammu which had a Hindu majority should be annexed to the Indian province of Maharashtra; that Ladakh be placed under Delhi's direct control and the valley of Kashmir including the fortifications [sic] together with areas with a Muslim majority be made into an independent state. Forty years ago, Sir Owen Dixon came to this area as a UN representative and studied conditions on both sides of the province. He then proposed that Jammu and Kashmir be divided between Pakistan and India with the river Chenab as the permanent boundary. When the proposal surfaced, the people of Kashmir opposed it vehemently and called it impracticable. The people of Kashmir will not tolerate any suggestion for the division of the province. In the different areas of occupied Kashmir, the day of Pakistan's establishment has traditionally been celebrated with great fervor, sincerity and respect whereas the following day, August 15, which is India's freedom day, has been observed by the Muslims of the province as the day of protest. Jamaat-I-Islami is now proposing that Azad Kashmir's frontiers be thrown open in order to allow the Kashmiris on either side to come and go freely. Such a step is necessary for another reason as well; the Kashmiris on both sides of the border would have to agree if an acceptable solution for the future of the province is to be found. The prime minister of Azad Kashmir, Sardar Abdul Qayum Khan, has been demanding for a long time that in order to find a practicable solution to the Kashmir issue, bona fide political leaders on both sides of the cease fire line be

invited to meet in a neutral country and the representatives of India and Pakistan be included in the conference. The question is, is India ready to find a solution through peaceful means.

Indian Proposal on Kashmir Viewed

94AS0069A Karachi JANG in Urdu 21 Oct 93 p 3

[Editorial: "The Kashmir Conflict: India's Proposal for Talks."]

[Text] Indian prime minister Narasimha Rao has sent a telegram to Benazir Bhutto congratulating her on her election to the premiership and among other things, has offered to hold early talks on all matters of disagreement between the two countries including Kashmir. According to the BBC, the Indian prime minister's letter is of greater significance than a mere congratulatory message; Benazir is expected to give her answer in the next 24 hours and to agree with the suggestion for negotiations.

It is an obvious fact that Kashmir is the basic reason for the tension between Pakistan and India. Pakistan wants the Kashmir issue to be solved in accordance with the UN resolutions in which India promised to allow the people of Indian occupied Kashmir to decide their own future. There are 3 parties to the conflict, Pakistan, the people of Kashmir and India. In 1948 and 1949, India ignored the resolutions of the UN and the Islamic Council [sic] and announced the annexation of occupied Kashmir to India. Its excuse for disregarding the promises it had made to the brotherhood of nations was that conditions had changed. But Pakistan stands steadfast on its position and the issue remains on the UN agenda.

The Kashmir issue has caused three major wars between Pakistan and India and innumerable border clashes. The fact is that the Kashmir issue has created so many difficulties and tensions between the two countries that they are forced to spend the major portion of their budgets on defense. Pakistan's repeated efforts to solve the issue peacefully have failed because Indian authorities remain obstinate and intransigent and continue to mouth the slogan that Kashmir is an inseparable part of India.

As the situation now stands, the people of occupied Kashmir have been carrying on an armed struggle for the last two and a half or three years to rid themselves of India and India has failed to crush the freedom movement with its army of more than 500,000 troops. India has, however, broken all records in the atrocities it has committed against the Kashmiri mujahideen and people. In spite of the many restrictions India has imposed, the world press continues to publish hair raising accounts of Indian atrocities. Indian military experts, political analysts and observers have made it clear to the Indian authorities that it was no longer possible for India to hold on to occupied Kashmir and that the area was in reality now outside India's control. But Indian authorities obstinately refuse to listen to any advice. They are trying to widen the conflict by accusing

Pakistan of interfering in occupied Kashmir, threatening dire consequences and amassing large numbers of troops and weapons on the control line. Indian troops now regularly bombard Azad Kashmir's border villages. Pakistan has once again raised the Kashmir issue in the UN and continues to support the Kashmiris' right to self determination.

Wnenever Indian authorites have become enmeshed in domestic problems and have been unable to resist outside pressures, they have tried to buy time by the manoeuvre of inviting Pakistan to discuss issues of disagreement. This has been the usual method followed by Indian authorities. At one time, they were unwilling even to discuss the Kashmir issue and would suggest that the solution to the conflict was for Pakistan to hand over Azad Kashmir to India. The Kashmiri mujahedeen have now rendered the Indian army powerless. The mujahideen have made innumerable sacrifices of wealth, honor and life; the whole world knows of Indian atrocities committed against Kashmiri Muslims. The possibility still exists that India is using negotiations once again to buy time, to deceive the world and put off Pakistan's demands. India may want to use negotiations as a cover for putting on hold the activity of the mujahedeen and the freedom movement. Pakistan has never refused to negotiate for a peaceful settlement of the Kashmir issue but the fact remains that negotiations have never produced any meaningful result. It is thus the duty of the newly elected government not to be deceived by India and not allow that country to use negotiations as a trick. If the talks are held under the supervision of the UN, there may be some hope of achieving results; otherwise, all one can expect from Indian authorities is summed up in the verse: they sat down, they talked and then went away.

Editorial Condemns Indian 'Repression' at Hazrat Bal

BK2310131793 Islamabad THE NATION in English
23 Oct 93 p 6

[Editorial: "Indian Iniquity"]

[Text] PM [Prime Minister] Benazir Bhutto's letter to the Indian PM Narasimha Rao, reciprocating his offer of talks on Kashmir which he made as part of his congratulatory message to her on assuming office, has reiterated Pakistan's well known position of being prepared to engage in serious and purposeful discussions on the issue which continues to bedevil relations between the two South Asian neighbours. The setting out of Pakistan's position comes at a time when tensions have been rising over the siege of the Hazrat Bal shrine, considered the most holy in the Valley. As a spin off, both countries have recently had recourse once more to mutual expulsions of diplomats India's persistence in its brutal campaign of repression in Kashmir has been raised to new heights by the cruel denial of food, water and medicine for days to the people trapped inside the shrine on the

one hand, while meeting attempted peaceful demonstrations to protest against the siege in Srinagar with the imposition of curfews, severe beatings, arrests and even killings. The hard intransigence of India in seeking a solution by sheer repression has taken a novel new twist in the arrest in Brussels of Mr Amanullah Khan, Chairman JKLF, who was in the Belgian capital for a conference on Kashmir. It is obvious that his arrest has come about as a result of Indian urgings and they have even demanded he be extradited to India, without even the benefit of an extradition treaty between India and Belgium. To these machinations the Belgian Government has become a willing accomplice. Our government is said to be making diplomatic efforts to get Mr Amanullah Khan released. If the Belgian Government does not respond, Pakistan should consider taking the issue to international forums like the UN, under whose resolutions the Kashmiris are still awaiting the exercise of their promised right of self-determination. The Belgian Government's totally unjustified act as well as the whole gamut of issues surrounding the Kashmir imbroglio is likely to be the focus of our diplomatic thrust at the Commonwealth summit in Cyprus. PM Benazir Bhutto has done well to take advantage of the opportunity the conference offers to personally put Pakistan's case on Kashmir before her distinguished audience. Other interests of the country may well also be served by the meeting of the newly inducted PM with the Commonwealth heads of government. But Kashmir, in the light of the present tensions and the escalating violence by the Indian army in the Valley, must take pride of place. In spite of the absence of Narasimha Rao depriving the two PMs of the opportunity of a face-to-face dialogue, but which opportunity may come again when PM Benazir Bhutto visits Delhi for a UNESCO Conference in December, Pakistan must forcefully bring the continuing Indian iniquity to the urgent attention of the world.

Prospect of Political Changes in Free Kashmir

94AS0070A Karachi AKHBAR-E-JEHAN in Urdu
24 Oct 93 p 12

[Article by Khaja Abdul Rashid: "Greater Likelihood of Political Changes in Azad Kashmir."]

[Text] The general elections recently held in Pakistan have created a state of both fear and hope for Azad Kashmir authorities and the opposition parties. The ruling party [in Azad Kashmir] openly sided in the elections with the Pakistan Muslim League Nawaz splinter and appointed various groups to help the League in its election campaign. However, the leader of the ruling party and president of Azad Kashmir, Sardar Sikander Hayat Khan, openly expressed his opposition to the policy of the Muslim Conference and maintained that Azad Kashmir's political parties and in particular the government of Azad Kashmir should not take sides in Pakistan's domestic politics because by doing so they might arouse opposition; but the party did not accept this view. Now that the election results are not what the

Muslim Conference expected, it is in a state of uncertainty and waiting to see what the attitude of Pakistan's new government will be toward Azad Kashmir's government. Sardar Sikander Hayat Khan has unhesitatingly proposed the formation of a national government in Azad Kashmir whereupon Sardar Abdul Qayum has promised to present the proposal when the executive body of the Muslim Conference holds its meeting. On the other hand, opposition parties especially the People's Party are hoping that following the assumption of office by the People's Party, political changes will take place in Azad Kashmir which will open the door to power for the People's Party. However, since the situation is still not clear, political silence is being maintained. Any kind of activity in Azad Kashmir will occur only after the process of government making is completed in Pakistan. The opposition has been carrying on a campaign against the present Azad Kashmir government for the last year or year and a half and, since the beginning of the current year, the parliamentary opposition has boycotted assembly sessions. The leader of the opposition, Mumtaz Rathor, and later the secretary general of the Liberation League, Khaja Farooq Ahmad, published a regular charge sheet against the government which contained 40 accusations of various kinds. The charge sheet was sent to the caretaker government [of Pakistan]; hence there is a clear possibility that after the government of Pakistan assumes office, Azad Kashmir's opposition will use the same accusations as the basis for its anti-government campaign.

Pakistan's caretaker government has announced the long-expected package of reforms for Gilgit and Baltistan. Last week, the caretaker federal cabinet announced during its meeting that the chief executive would be in charge of the administration of the Northern territories; he would have the same powers as a provincial chief minister and enjoy the same rank as that of a federal minister. This decision was taken two days before elections for the national assembly. According to this decision, the number of council members for the Northern territories would be increased from 21 to 26; the chief commissioner's office would be reorganized and, in order to make the judiciary of the Northern territories independent, it was further decided to appoint a judicial commissioner who would be a judge at present serving on the high court or a retired judge. The decision leaves the constitutional status of the Northern territories unchanged; the chief executive will continue to be appointed by the federal government and would be answerable to it. Later, the federal minister for information and broadcasting, Nisar Maiman, said during his tour of Askardo that no change in the present status of the Northern territories would take place until the Kashmir issue was solved. Pakistan's ministry of law is preparing the draft of a law regarding administrative and legal reforms in the Northern territories. The caretaker government took this step in accordance with the wishes of the people expressed during the tour of the Northern territories by the president and the prime minister.

The people of Gilgit and Baltistan have been demanding basic rights for a long time. All the administrative affairs of those areas are under the jurisdiction of Pakistan's ministry for affairs relating to Kashmir and the Northern territories. As for the judicial system, the judicial commissioner, whose rank is equal to that of a session judge, constitutes the highest judicial authority but the decisions of his court can be changed or revoked by the head of the administration there; hence, the concept of an independent judiciary is lacking. The people of Gilgit and Baltistan are demanding that these territories be included once again in Azad Kashmir and brought within the jurisdiction of the Azad Kashmir legislative assembly and supreme court. Certain other circles, however, are demanding that the Northern territories be made Pakistan's fifth province whereas some others want the territories to be given a separate status similar to that of Azad Kashmir. Recently, the demand to be included in Azad Kashmir heightened in these areas. As a result of a writ of petition filed by two individuals from Gilgit, the Azad Kashmir High Court issued its historical decision on April 8 of this year. In addition to affirming that Gilgit and Baltistan were the legal and historical parts of the province of Jammu and Kashmir, the Court instructed the Azad Kashmir government to take over without delay the administrative control of Gilgit and Baltistan and establish administrative and judicial institutions there. The Court ruled that the civil rights of the inhabitants of Gilgit and Baltistan were the same as those enjoyed by the citizens of Azad Kashmir. After this decision by the High Court, heated demands were made in Gilgit and Baltistan that the Court's decision be implemented and the people of the Northern territories be given representation in Azad Kashmir's assembly, government and administration. The government of Azad Kashmir found itself in a quandary because [Pakistan's] ministry for Kashmir affairs expressed strong opposition to the Court decision. The ministry bureaucrats rule over Gilgit and Baltistan and do not want to lose their power. The very thought of giving up this authority is painful to the ministry. In spite of its claims, the government of Azad Kashmir was taken aback by the Court's decision and announced unequivocally that it was not in a position to take over the administrative duties of Gilgit and Baltistan. Accordingly, the government appealed to the Supreme Court against that part of the High Court's decision which instructed the government to take over the administrative tasks of the two territories. The administration of Gilgit and Baltistan was entrusted to the ministry for Kashmir affairs by a three partite agreement in April 1949 signed in Karachi by Azad Kashmir's premier at that time, Sardar Mohammad Ibrahim Khan; the head of the Muslim Conference the late Chaudhry Ghulam Abbas and Pakistan's minister without portfolio Mushtaq Ahmad Gurmani. The reason why the Karachi agreement handed over the administration of Gilgit and Baltistan to the government of Pakistan was that a war of liberation was being fought in Kashmir and the attention of the government of Azad Kashmir was totally devoted to this war. Moreover, the absence of any direct land route to

the two territories made communication difficult. These two obstacles no longer exist and there is now a legislative assembly as well as democratic and judicial institutions in Azad Kashmir but the people of Gilgit and Baltistan continue to be deprived of their basic rights. Demands are now being made to revoke the Karachi agreement and return the administration of the two territories to the government of Azad Kashmir. The decision of the caretaker government to appoint a chief executive for Gilgit and Baltistan with powers similar to that of a chief minister may help to solve some of the problems but will not restore the fundamental rights of the people of the territories. However, satisfaction is being expressed over the decision of the government of Pakistan not to make any change in the status of the two territories.

Paper Accuses India of 'Ethnic Cleansing' in Kashmir

*BK2410102593 Islamabad THE PAKISTAN TIMES
in English 24 Oct 93 p 6*

[Editorial: "A Dialogue on Kashmir"]

[Text] Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto has drawn world attention to the growing intensity of human rights violations in Occupied Kashmir and emphasised the need to resolve the festering issues through negotiations. Speaking at the third executive session of the Commonwealth heads of government in Cyprus on Friday, she stated that the policy of double standards should be discarded with a view to seeking peaceful settlement of international disputes. She pointed out that the situation in held Kashmir had deteriorated alarmingly which was causing utmost concern to Pakistan. Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto expressed her confidence that the dispute could be settled through negotiation. She briefed several heads of government attending the Commonwealth meet on the grave human rights violations being committed by India in the valley. She apprised British Prime Minister John Major of the inhuman atrocities being perpetrated by Indian security forces on innocent Kashmiris. She told him that Pakistan had called for dispatching a fact-finding mission to Kashmir for examining the human rights abuses on the spot. She urged Mr. Major to support 'Pakistan's resolution mooted at the Commonwealth heads summit and he agreed to closely study Pakistan's request. Ms. Benazir Bhutto also invited British businessmen to invest in Pakistan, particularly in the project for laying a railway line connecting Pakistan with Central Asia. The British Premier responded positively to her suggestion and said that a British delegation would be sent to Pakistan to explore the avenues of cooperation. Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto expressed her disappointment at the absence of the Indian Prime Minister from the Commonwealth meeting and said she would have discussed the Kashmir issue and other bilateral matters with him.

Meanwhile, the situation created by the Indian army's assault on Hazratbal Complex in Srinagar has taken a

very dangerous turn. The Indian troops have shot dead at least 35 persons in indiscriminate firing on crowds of Kashmiris marching towards the besieged shrine. Due to mounting international concern and pressure, Indian Premier Narasimha Rao has instructed Army Chief Gen B.C. Joshi to lift the siege but the latter has refused to do so, saying that the withdrawal from the shrine would adversely affect the morale of his troops. He has instead sought permission to conduct a surgical strike on the holy shrine to round up a few freedom fighters lodged therein. It is the first time that an Indian army chief has blatantly disobeyed the orders of the government. This has added a highly alarming dimension to the Hazratbal episode. On the other hand, the United States has called for a peaceful resolution of the Kashmir issue and advised the Indian government to exercise utmost restraint in the military action against the Hazratbal shrine. It is now evident that in sheer desperation New Delhi is pursuing a policy of planned genocide of the Muslim population—a version of the insidious “ethnic cleansing” unleashed by the Serbs in Bosnia. By exercising prudence and realism, it can still avert the disaster inherent in a Vietnam-like situation. The only option for India to get out of the mess of its own making is to start a meaningful dialogue with Pakistan immediately for seeking a settlement of the dispute that conforms to the genuine aspirations of the Kashmiri people. Mr. Narasimha Rao has expressed his willingness to initiate talks with Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto and the latter has already responded positively to it. Mr. Rao should vindicate his willingness by withdrawing Indian troops from the Hazratbal Complex at once and then set a date for starting the dialogue with Pakistan. Once this process is initiated, steps could be taken to mitigate tension and differences in other areas of Pakistan-India relations. The sub-continent needs to be rid of the tension and distrust that has been gripping it for decades because of the Kashmir issue. It is time people on the both sides of the border were allowed a respite and provided a sense of security after an endless spell of suffering.

Paper Urges 'Meaningful' Dialogue With India

*BK3010141593 Islamabad PAKISTAN in Urdu
28 Oct 93 p 7*

[Editorial: “Conditions for Pakistan-India Dialogue”]

[Text] During discussions held between the foreign secretaries of Pakistan and India during the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in Nicosia, Cyprus, a consensus was reached to restart the dialogue between the two countries. According to BBC, Indian Foreign Secretary J.N. Dixit and his Pakistani counterpart Shaharyar Khan also exchanged views on the Kashmir situation. The Indian foreign secretary has said that India is ready for a dialogue with Pakistan and it can be held only when the situation becomes clear after the formation of a new government in Pakistan. It may take weeks and months for the situation to become clear. In his interview with BBC, Foreign Minister Farooq Leghari said: we told India that we are in favor of

holding talks, but we want them to be meaningful and productive. For this, it is essential to reduce tension in Kashmir, withdraw the troops stationed there, and end the siege of Hazratbal Shrine. As long as all these conditions remain unfulfilled, the talks under these circumstances will be fruitless. Pakistan's stand is realistic.

If India continues its reign of terror in occupied Kashmir and to desecrate the Hazratbal Shrine, to bleed the unarmed Kashmiris and play with their dignity and honor, and on the contrary pretend before the world to be interested in talks, what will be the use of the fruitless and meaningless talks held under such circumstances? If India understands the need to establish durable and lasting peace in the region and is interested in uplifting its people from deep penury and fulfilling their basic needs, it will have to give up its current tendency of oppression and suppression. India must be prepared to resolve the Kashmir issue, and fulfill all the above conditions. Otherwise, the talks will be a mere formality. This kind of talks have been held on earlier occasions. Now, steps should be taken to make them meaningful and this will be possible only when the conditions laid down by Farooq Leghari are fulfilled.

Meanwhile, addressing the first session of the federal cabinet, Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto expressed concern at the situation in occupied Kashmir and urged India to begin talks with Pakistan for a peaceful political settlement of the issue. She also asked India to end the siege of Hazratbal Shrine. Benazir Bhutto said her government will not compromise on the Kashmir issue and will seek a solution which will be in accordance with the aspirations of the Kashmiri people. Describing the conditions created by Indian occupation forces in occupied Kashmir as extremely dangerous to the region, certain circles have said that if effective measures are not taken to prevent India from pursuing its drive against the Kashmiris, peace in the region may be disturbed. Pakistan is keeping a watch on the rapidly changing situation in occupied Kashmir. Besides adopting security measures, it has intensified its efforts to establish lasting peace in the region. The proposal for meaningful talks with India is also a part of these efforts.

Kashmiri Senator Calls for Jihad Against India

*BK3010103393 Islamabad THE PAKISTAN
OBSERVER in English 29 Oct 93 p 12*

[Text] Islamabad—Rejecting moves for dialogue with New Delhi on Kashmir Jamaat Chief Senator Qazi Hussain Ahmad Thursday called upon the Benazir government to declare Jihad on India to save Kashmir Muslims from total annihilation.

Addressing the joint session of the Parliament Qazi said talks with India at this crucial juncture of Kashmiris' freedom struggle would tend to weaken their resolve. “In fact, the dialogue would add insult to the injury of the Kashmiris who are being subjected to history's worst atrocities.”

Earlier, Foreign Minister Faroog Leghari, opening debate on the current situation in Kashmir with special reference to the siege of Darah Hazratoal, had accepted Indian Prime Minister Rao's offer dialogue, subject to certain preconditions. His speech was taken by the Jamaat Amir as a move to defuse tension and avert war.

Qazi Hussain Ahmad said, ironically, "if you want to avoid war, at all costs, then hoist the white flag". But he reminded the foreign minister that a nuclear device could provide the only guarantee against war, as it did by saving the world from the Third Great War.

Maulana Azam Tariq, the other member representing the politico-religious parties in the parliament, however, took a far more student line on the question of Kashmir. His main argument was that war in Kashmir is basically for the defence of Pakistan. He strongly criticised the presence of Pakistani troops in Somalia, where, he charged, they are being used by the Americans for the massacre of Somalian brothers-in-faith.

Qazi Hussain Ahmad's speech, which simultaneously targeted both the previous governments of Ms Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif, was heard in deep silence [sentence as published]. Political expediency apart, his message appeared to have been received and accepted by the members which included MNAs [Members of National Assembly] and Senators. The debate is expected to continue next week.

Qazi ridiculed the United States repeated harping on human rights. Is not the US biggest terrorist because it is the only country that did not hesitate to use an atom bomb, he asked. "In face of their (Americans) own interests the human rights just faded away."

The Amir Jamaat-I-Islami held the view that our foreign ministry and our missions overseas have failed to apprise the international community of the real nature of the Kashmir dispute, so much so that most of the outsiders think that Kashmir is India's internal affair. Nobody seems to be aware of the existence of the United Nations resolutions. The Simla Accord, he said, too has confused the issue. He opined that let India first openly admit that Kashmir is a disputed territory.

Qazi Hussain Ahmad asked when Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) is planning to send a force of hundred thousands retired soldiers to Kashmir. Let us wage Jihad for Kashmir. A nuclear-armed Pakistan would deter India from a wider conflict, he added.

Azam Tariq in his high-profile exposition complained that none of the Muslim countries has given Pakistan open support on Kashmir. He blamed various governments of failure to awaken the Ummah. He also called upon the Muslim countries to throw out their Indian residents to throw out their Indian residents as protest against its atrocities in Kashmir.

He said if troops can be sent to Sindh, these should be despatched to Kashmir also, because Kashmir is part of Pakistan. "And, if you cannot do that then forget about Kashmir."

Saying that 50,000 Kashmiris have already been killed, Maulana asked the government the figure of deaths that would justify declaration of war against India. "We are already at war, and if you, the government, cannot render any help, get lost. If the Mujahideen can break up the erstwhile Soviet Union, the Kashmiris would liberate Kashmir, which would, inevitably, lead to the disintegration of India."

U.S. Official's Statement on Kashmir Criticized

94AS0052D Peshawar MASHRIQ in Urdu 1 Nov 93 p 3

[Editorial: "The U.S. Touched an Indian Nerve."]

[Text] A senior official of the U. S. administration clarified in an important policy statement that the U.S. regarded Jammu and Kashmir as disputed areas and it did not accept Maharajah Hari Singh's signed documents of annexation [to India]. The U.S. spokesman said that the Kashmir issue should be regarded, not in the background of efforts made in 1949 or 1962 but in the light of the violations of human rights being made in 1993; that the price being paid for this conflict in terms of the violations of human rights was quite unacceptable; that the U. S. was concerned over the situation because it created instability in South Asia. In answer to an Indian journalist's question, the U. S. official said that the U. S. regarded the Simla agreement as a forum for bilateral talks between India and Pakistan but that for the last 20 years, no talks had taken place under this agreement on the Kashmir issue and hence the Simla agreement was no longer effective. The U.S. official accepted a point made by an Indian journalist that in recent years, Pakistan was reported to be aiding and supporting the Kashmiris but he added that such aid had lessened considerably in recent years and the U.S. regarded the present situation in occupied Kashmir to be the result of internal factors.

We attach great importance to the U.S. official's statement on Kashmir. It was given at a time when the siege of the Hazratbal shrine and the atrocities inflicted on the Kashmiris have centered world attention on the Kashmir issue. U.S. Undersecretary of State, Robin Raphael, is due to pay her first official visit to this area. She has already acknowledged in a statement that the rebellion in the valley of Kashmir was not instigated by outside interference but resulted from internal causes. In our view, the blood soaked state of occupied Kashmir has caused the U.S. and the entire brotherhood of nations to reject India's worn out arguments that Kashmir was annexed to India and an inseparable part of that country; that because of the Simla agreement, the Kashmir issue could not be discussed in a world forum; that negotiations could take place only under the Simla

agreement or that the situation in occupied Kashmir was the result of Pakistani interference.

All these arguments used by India have lost their credibility in the eyes of the civilized world and today, no man can deny that Kashmir is a disputed territory and the problem needs a just solution. The sacrifices in blood which the Kashmiris have made over the last three years for the right of self-determination and the shameless manner in which the demon of Indian dictatorship has shown its true nature in the Hazrat Bal incident and trampled upon the human rights of unarmed Kashmiris have stirred the conscience of the world.

Daily Notes Indian Preparations To Attack Azad Kashmir

*BK0311151593 Rawalpindi NAWA-I-WAQT in Urdu
1 Nov 93 pp 8, 4*

[Text] Muzaffarabad (KASHMIR PRESS INTERNATIONAL)—India has moved a large number of fresh troops and a big consignment of heavy weapons to the Keran Sector. Thousands of people have fled the Keran Sector after being tormented by the increasing incidents of shooting by the Indian troops, who have turned people's empty houses into bunkers. Firing has been continuing in the Lepa and Chakothi sectors for the past several days. The Indians fired at trailers and a jeep in the Athmuqam and Chakothi sectors respectively, causing damage to the vehicles.

According to the KASHMIR PRESS INTERNATIONAL correspondent, digging of trenches and positions, which was started by the Indian forces in the Keran Sector on an emergency basis a few days ago, is continuing with full speed and a large number of fresh troops and a huge consignment of heavy weapons have been moved into that sector. Thousands of people, distressed by the Indian forces' brutalities, have fled the Keran Sector and the troops have demolished the roofs of the houses vacated by them and turned them into their bunkers.

According to informed sources, the activities of the Indian forces in the border areas are a part of preparations by India to attack Azad Kashmir and that is why the Indian forces have started conducting full-fledged war exercises in the Keran Sector and increased the number of troops in all sectors adjoining Azad Kashmir. Chakothi and Lepa sectors have been the targets of Indian firings for the past several days. Several people are reported to have been injured as result of Indian firing in the Khiratta Sector. The Indian forces opened fire at Bagna near the Athmuqam Sector at about 1400 on Sunday, damaging trailers moving toward Athmuqam. They also fired at a jeep in Chakothi, but there is no report of any casualty except for the damage caused to the jeep.

Commentary Points to U.S., European 'Plans' on Kashmir

*BK0311152193 Islamabad KHABRAIN in Urdu
2 Nov 93 p 11*

[Commentary by Mohammad Habib Jalib: "The Kashmir Issue and U.S. Intentions"]

[Text] The recent siege of the Hazratbal shrine, the conference on Kashmir held at the same time in Brussels, and the arrest of Amanullah Khan—Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front chief—in Brussels itself during the same time despite the fact that he was issued a visa, are part of an organized plan. The United States and European countries will make use of these plans while deciding Kashmir's future and will advocate a formula to divide Kashmir. Amanullah Khan and his group are being groomed at the global level. When Amanullah Khan acknowledged in Washington the responsibility for the abduction and subsequent murder of the vice chancellor of the Kashmir University, then India pressed the United States to immediately arrest him and hand him over to India. But instead of arresting Amanullah Khan or handing him over to India, the United States declared him *persona non grata* and expelled him from the country.

The situation after the settlement of the Palestine problem has changed. The United States now wants to find a solution to the Kashmir problem, which does not increase Pakistan's strength and is acceptable to India as well. Neither the United States nor Europe is willing to talk with the strongest Kashmiri organization, the Hezbullah Mojahidin. They want to pick up people who are willing to follow their instructions. It seems that they are looking for a Yasir 'Arafat in the occupied Kashmir and Azad Kashmir. They have succeeded in making Sardar Abdul Qayyum Khan, the Azad Kashmir prime minister, agree to accept the third option. His recent visit to the United States was related to this move. According to reports, Sardar Abdul Qayyum Khan also enjoys the support of some Pakistani agencies in this regard. The United States and Europe wanted some people from the mujahedin organizations of Kashmir, which they have found now in Amanullah Khan. Amanullah Khan heads the pro-independence organization of the Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front. Moreover, he is a quite well-known figure in the world circles in relation to Kashmir. So, Sardar Abdul Qayyum Khan and Amanullah Khan have been groomed for the execution of the plan on Kashmir.

The United States sought to achieve two objectives from the arrest of Amanullah Khan in Brussels. One is, to project him through the court case as a hero of the freedom movement and to secure his honorable release so that the U.S. expulsion order against him could be terminated, thereby paving the way for the legality of his visit to the United States. The second objective the United States intend to achieve is to give a worldwide publicity to Amanullah Khan by this case and present

him as a well-recognized leader of the Kashmiris. Amanullah Khan's arrest after he was issued a visa by the Belgian Government reveals that he was arrested according to a preplanned scheme. Wide publicity is now being given to the Amanullah Khan case all over Europe. The U.S. media is also going to play its part in pushing Amanullah Khan into the limelight. Sardar Abdul Qayyum Khan has already played his part in this regard. The very person who once used to brand Amanullah Khan as a traitor and an agent of the Qadiani sect is now making trips to London to secure the release of Amanullah Khan. It clearly reveals that talks have already been held between the CIA and Sardar Abdul Qayyum Khan in this regard and now Qayyum Khan is trying to push up Amanullah Khan so that he gets at least one leader among the mujahedin groups when a settlement is reached on the Kashmir issue.

Sardar Qayyum Khan wants to see his name written in the history of the settlement of the Kashmir problem. He does not care if Pakistan or the Kashmiris are hurt in this process. At the global level, the United States has already decided to divide Kashmir and it is only a matter of time to get this scheme implemented. A policy in this regard has also been formulated by Stephen Solarz. Although full details of this policy is not available at this moment, informed sources however say that India too has a soft corner toward this policy. Sardar Abdul Qayyum Khan was also briefed in New York on this policy. Sardar Abdul Qayyum Khan is playing a dual role. He is maintaining contacts with sensitive organizations of Pakistan as well as with the U.S. lobby. Now Pakistan will have to decide whether it is willing to bear another Afghanistan-like trouble. In Afghanistan, Gulbuddin Hekmatyar was abandoned in keeping with the wishes of the United States. And the people of Pakistan and Afghanistan are now bearing its consequences. The same thing will happen to the occupied Kashmir where Sardar Abdul Qayyum Khan has been declared the representative of Kashmiris, while the Hizbul Mujahedin possesses weapons and enjoys popular support. Given this situation, if Sardar Abdul Qayyum Khan or anyone else moves ahead with a plan to divide Kashmir, then he will be able to realize nothing but to initiate a bloodshed in Kashmir. What is amazing is that no member of Sardar Abdul Qayyum's group has so far joined the struggle in the occupied Kashmir. But obeying the American instructions he himself has joined Amanullah Khan in the movement for the sovereignty of a divided Kashmir!

Editorial Urges Peaceful Solution to Kashmir Problems

*BK0311155493 Islamabad PAKISTAN in Urdu
3 Nov 93 p 4*

[Editorial: "Indian Preparations To Attack Azad Kashmir"]

[Text] Observers have described the arrival of additional Indian troops in the Keran sector of occupied Kashmir as dangerous, and said that there are indications that due

to its bafflement by the intensity of the self-determination movement, India is now considering launching an offensive against Azad Kashmir. Persistent fire by Indian forces is continuing in the Lepa, Chakothi and Athmuqam sectors resulting in loss of life and destruction of rural houses. India's foolish decision to use force instead of resolving the Kashmir issue by peaceful means will lead to disastrous consequences. Instead of ending the Hazratbal shrine siege, India has sent more troops there, while the Kashmiris are marching toward the shrine ignoring the curfew restrictions. They are forced to halt and retreat due to obstructions put in their way and the indiscriminate shooting by the Indian forces. As soon as they get a chance, they resume their march toward the shrine.

How long will India be playing brutally with the lives in Kashmir, and how long will it remain engaged in activities which threaten peace in the entire region? No one can say anything about it. It is the duty of the United Nations to take steps to restrain India from violating human rights, and obtain the help of peace-loving countries of the world in this regard. There are sensible and farsighted people in India itself who think that the Indian policy on Kashmir is totally wrong and consider it a threat, not only to the Kashmiris but to millions of people in this region. Time and again, they have impressed upon the Indian rulers of the need to seek a peaceful settlement of this problem. Unfortunately, these persuasions have had no effect so far on the Indian rulers. Given this situation, it becomes imperative that the international community convince India to resolve the Kashmir issue according to UN resolutions before the situation takes a serious turn.

Editorial Criticizes Indian Actions in Kashmir

*BK0511141793 Islamabad THE PAKISTAN TIMES
in English 5 Nov 93 p 6*

[Editorial: "Kashmir: India Losing Face"]

[Text] At the weekly press briefing a Foreign Office spokesman said that Pakistan appreciated the statement recently made by a senior official of the U.S. State Department reaffirming Washington's position on Jammu and Kashmir and regarding it as a disputed territory. While briefing newsmen in Washington on the forthcoming visit of Ms. Robin Raphael, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for South Asian Affairs to Pakistan and some other countries of the region, the State Department official said that "the U.S. does not recognise the instrument of accession signed by Maharaja Hari Singh of Kashmir in 1947 and also does not accept that Kashmir is forever a part of India". Commenting on this the Foreign Office spokesman acknowledged that it is for the first time that a senior official of the State Department has publicly rejected the accession. Referring to the creation of a separate bureau for South Asia in the State Department, the spokesman remarked that it reflects the U.S. administration's interest in the region.

India's forcible occupation of Kashmir and the atrocities it is perpetrating on the population there is now attracting world attention and evoking condemnation from all quarters international concern has been raised over the worsening human rights record of India. [sentence as published] The killing of at least local 15,000 persons in occupied Kashmir, mainly civilians since 1990, has gained wide publicity and tarnished India's image worldwide. As the prestigious American weekly Time International has put it, "Increasingly India seems to be losing an international public relations battle" because of its brutalities in Kashmir where the situation has worsened after the siege of Hazratbal shrine by the Indian troops on October 15. The Vice-President of the Asia Society based in USA Mr. Marshal Botono has said that India has created a tangible situation by besieging the shrine. According to him, the Kashmir issue is like a bomb fuse which can erupt a vast war in the region. The Kashmiris, he says, have forced the United Nations through their freedom movement that it should take positive steps for the immediate solution of the policy adopted by their government with regard to Kashmir. The latest to express his concern over the situation is Dr. Karan Singh, son of the last Maharaja of Kashmir, who bemoans the killing of thousands of Kashmiris and burning down of their houses. The Kashmir valley is on the brink of disaster, he said, he admitted that Pakistan has been a party to the Kashmir dispute since 1947 and "we cannot neglect it". He suggested tripartite talks between Pakistan, India and the Kashmiris to find a solution of the Kashmir problem. Meanwhile, Pakistan is sending parliamentarians to various parts of the world to mobilise public opinion about Kashmir. A resolution is also being tabled at the United Nations in its third committee on human rights. This resolution is being co-sponsored by at least half a dozen member countries but the number may increase as consultations are going on with others. All those for peace in the region realise that it is the non-resolution of the Kashmir issue which is the main cause of tension prevailing there. It is high time India also saw the writing on the wall and shed its obduracy in the matter. The Kashmiris who have offered unprecedented sacrifices for their inalienable right to decide their own future cannot be subdued by the force of arms. It is only through a dialogue that a lasting settlement can be arrived at.

Commentary Lauds 'U.S. Appreciation' of Kashmir Viewpoint

BK1111083193 Islamabad Radio Pakistan Network in English 1600 GMT 10 Nov 93

[Commentary by M. Amin]

[Text] Relations between the United States and Pakistan had always been friendly. The seeds of this friendship had been sown soon after Pakistan's attaining independent nationhood in 1947. Over the years and decades, the bonds of friendship between the two countries had consistently grown and assumed the form and substance of a very strong bonds of alliance. There were, of course,

ups and downs in this relationship. But it had generally sustained, achieving its highest mark during the Afghanistan crisis when the two countries collaborated with one another with full faith in one another's sincerity and reliability. Since late 1990 however, a gradual deterioration in these relations had set in.

In the wake of the withdrawal of the Soviet forces from Afghanistan, the end of the Cold War and the breakup of the Soviet Union, the United States which assumed the role of sole superpower started voicing [as heard] Pakistan's modest peaceful nuclear program in a somewhat different light resulting in the most strongest application of the highly discriminatory Pressler law and stoppage by the United States of all economic and military assistance to Pakistan. What was more was that perhaps swayed by India's disinformation campaign, the United States believed that the freedom struggle of the people in the Indian-occupied Kashmir which had gained unprecedented momentum since 1989 was materially and physically supported by Pakistan.

There was an unfortunate stage in the U.S.-Pakistan relation until the end of last year when Pakistan was on the so-called U.S. watch list of terrorist states. This issue was happily settled when the United States was satisfied that Pakistan's support to the Kashmiri freedom fighters was confined to moral, political and diplomatic spheres only which Pakistan also always accepted [as heard]. But, that the Kashmiri uprising was genuinely legitimate and in fact it was India that was responsible for gross human rights violations in the held territory. [sentence as heard]

This welcome pleasant change in the U.S. perception of the issue whose indications were discernible as early as advent of Clinton administration has been reinforced by the recent pronouncements of the United States' newly installed assistant secretary of state for South Asia, Ms. Robin Raphael, who recently visited Afghanistan, Bangladesh, and Pakistan and had in-depth discussion with the Pakistani leadership and Foreign Office officials. Briefing the federal cabinet the other day on her talks with Ms. Robin Raphael, the Pakistani prime minister, Ms. Benazir Bhutto, observed that the U.S. assistant secretary of state's visit had brightened prospects for improved and positive relations between the United States and Pakistan.

On Kashmir, the United States high officials, including Ms. Raphael, has recently stated repeatedly that the entire state was a disputed territory and the United States can never recognize the Kashmiri Maharaja's accession of the state to India as final. Also, it is gratifying that it is now the U.S. view that the Kashmiri struggle for liberation is state-based [as heard]. It has sustained and India's track record of human rights in the occupied state is nowhere near the state of normal acceptability.

Finally, Pakistan cannot but appreciate the U.S. appreciation of the Pakistani viewpoint that there is a linkage between the Kashmir dispute and the nuclear program of Pakistan, meaning thereby that so long as Kashmir exists

as the (bone) of contention between India and Pakistan and then [there] is a security threat to Pakistan because of the unresolved dispute of Kashmir, Pakistan could not possible forsake its nuclear option. Hopefully, the misunderstanding that had cropped up between the United States and Pakistan on grounds that did not really have a firm basis would soon totally disappear and the relations between the two countries would again assume warmth and strengthen in their fullness.

Editorial Opposes Nonmilitary Zone Status for Siachen

*BK1211094793 Rawalpindi NAWA-I-WAQT in Urdu
11 Nov 93 p 10*

[Editorial: "Siachen—A Nonmilitary Zone?"]

[Text] At an informal briefing after the end of the visit by Robin Raphael, U.S. assistant secretary of state, a senior American officer said that it has been decided to declare the Siachen Glacier a nonmilitary zone. He said that Pakistan and India are close to an agreement and details are being worked out. The American officer further said that 20,000 troops are fighting in the chilly region while there is actually no need for a deployment of forces. Pakistani Foreign Minister Leghari has said that Pakistan and India agree that the Siachen problem can be "easily" resolved through negotiations.

The first impression the briefing has created is that Pakistan has failed to recover its beautiful glacier from the Indian troops. The claims that the sanctity of every inch of Pakistani soil will be maintained and its soil will be protected from unholy seizure by the enemy seem unsubstantiated. A little attention will make it abundantly clear that the whole situation is indicative of the beginning of a new serious problem. A nonmilitary zone can also be called a "no man's land." It is a strange logic.

Despite verbally describing Kashmir as a disputed issue, the United States is also pursuing a policy to help India achieve new successes or victories by declaring as non-military zones the Pakistani territories which the Indian troops guilefully captured even long after the cease-fire line and the Line of Control were demarcated. God knows what kind of "peace ideology" it is. The Pakistani territories are gradually being declared "nonmilitary" zones and cooperation is being extended to India in fulfilling its conspiracy by encouraging India's conspicuous colonialist mentality and its blatant aggression. It seems that all this is a part of the latest edition of the U.S. policy of appeasing India under the new U.S. world order.

It is no secret now that surprisingly a process of ensuring India's "step by step hegemony" is underway in Pakistan's northern [as published] region. After occupied Kashmir, India has now succeeded to a considerable extent in fulfilling its conspiracy to "dislodge" Pakistan from the Siachen Glacier. The fact is that not only Siachen Glacier, but its north and south and east and west are of utmost importance to Pakistan's defense as

well as the Pakistani-Chinese trade and other ties. The people running the affairs in Pakistan should remember that the status of Siachen is like a roof of our country, where the enemy can jump into our courtyard at any moment. The Siachen agreement is said to be "under consideration." Therefore, what is imperative is that national interests and defense needs be given priority instead of complying with the wishes of any superpower, and every inch of soil should be fully protected, considering it a sacred trust.

Editorial Stresses Need To Counter Indian 'Propaganda'

*BK1511123993 Rawalpindi NAWA-I-WAQT in Urdu
15 Nov 93 p 3*

[Editorial: "India's False Propaganda"]

[Text] All India Radio has charged that, at present, more than 500 members of the Pakistani intelligence agency Inter Services Intelligence—ISI—are active in occupied Kashmir. They not only incite the Kashmiri freedom fighters against the Indian Government but also hatch plans for attacks. This is not the first time that the Indian media has leveled this sort of allegation against Pakistan, but India itself has been making a series of allegations that Pakistan's hand is behind the Kashmiri struggle for freedom and that credit for the success of the Kashmiri freedom fighters on the battlefield should go to the Pakistani Army. One of the aims of these kinds of allegations leveled by India is to boost the morale of its distraught Army, which is suffering heavy losses at the hands of the freedom fighters. Another is to divert the world's attention from the Kashmiri struggle for freedom and put the focus on Pakistan. India is committing atrocities against the Kashmiris and is facing criticism from all over the world for violating human rights. India wants Pakistan to be put on trial in its place, and is making efforts to achieve this. Therefore, India is leveling allegations against Pakistan that its intelligence agency ISI is assisting the Kashmiris. Pakistan should not only vehemently deny such allegations, but should also tell the world that India's allegations are meant to cover up its own crimes. In this era of propaganda, to keep quiet is tantamount to admitting the crime. Hence, Pakistan should openly respond to the Indian propaganda.

Commentary Urges Improved Atmosphere for Kashmir Talks

*BK1811055193 Islamabad Radio Pakistan Network
in English 1600 GMT 17 Nov 93*

[Commentary by A.B.S. Jafri]

[Text] The lifting of the siege of the sacred shrine of Hazratbal after 32 days which shook the world into a new and deeper awareness of the 46-year-old Kashmir dispute has been received in Pakistan with profound relief. This event sends out some highly significant

messages to the world community, to the rulers in India in particular. Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto's instant reaction was to salute the freedom fighters in occupied Kashmir who had won a majestic victory against forces of repression.

Indian Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao could have served himself by restraining from commenting on the conclusion of the siege. But, by saying that he and his government and Army had emerged from the Hazratbal siege with flying colors is bound to invite the ridicule on a universal scale. In the first place, the tactic of laying a siege to a place of worship was a'n magnitude.ed at sacred places with anything but the strongest distaste. And, [passage illegible] land of many faiths, some of them of most ancient origins. India also makes tall claims about it [passage illegible]. How secular? India's military action of Hazratbal shrine and its sequel would demonstrate without any further comment.

The fact is that the freedom fighters in occupied Kashmir have achieved a most spectacular victory. It has jolted a lethargic and indifferent world conscience into a sharp awareness of what exactly the Kashmir dispute is about and how awfully bad is the human rights situation in occupied Kashmir. From all over the world, India is receiving messages which would hardly do India proud.

Never in its history was the Kashmir dispute so prominently in the headlines all over the world. It was this world outrage which obliged New Delhi to beat a retreat from Hazratbal. The inmates of shrine during the siege have been taken into custody. But the understanding evidently is that they will be treated with due consideration and decency. However, going by the track record of whatever goes under the name of government in occupied Kashmir, one cannot be too sure. That there are misgivings on this (score) in Pakistan is reflected in Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto's emphasis that this country, indeed the world, would expect India to treat the freedom fig.lter in an absolutely humane and respectful manner. The prime minister has sought the attention of the world to this point in her effort to ensure that those taken in custody on the promise of decent treatment are actually treated in a civilized manner.

During the siege, the prime minister had on several occasions drawn the attention of the Government of India and the international community to the need for seeking a peacefully negotiated settlement of a dispute which is nearing half a century of immensely costly consequences to all concerned.

In view of the complex nature which the Kashmir dispute has come to have, thanks entirely to the shifting positions adopted by New Delhi, Prime Minister Bhutto has suggested that for a dialogue between Pakistan and India in search of a solution to the Kashmir dispute, there should be a one-point agenda. This is an imminently sensible and transparently fair suggestion. If the dispute is to be resolved in a satisfactory manner and without undue delay, both countries should be enabled

to focus on it without any distractions. Meanwhile, as Premier Bhutto has advised India, efforts needs to be concentrated on defusing the present tensions. It is more than obvious that the entire occupied Kashmir is in the grip of a wave of resentment against the violence perpetrated by Indian Army. About 7,500 men have been killed during the past three years. The wounds are raw. There is an instant need to bring the temperature down. This would be all the more necessary if a start is to be made toward a dialogue between Islamabad and New Delhi.

Urdu Daily Rejects Hurd's Proposals on Kashmir

*BK1711125393 Rawalpindi NAWA-I-WAQT in Urdu
17 Nov 93 p 10*

[Editorial: "The British Solution to Kashmir Issue"]

[Text] Talking to the BBC, British Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd has suggested that Pakistan and India should take three steps to resolve the Kashmir problem and those are: The beginning of a dialog between India and Pakistan; the holding of negotiations between the Indian government and the representative leadership of Kashmir; and an end to the external interference in Kashmir.

The Kashmir oispute was actually created by Britain which did not execute the division of the subcontinent in a just and fair manner and with a trickery carried out through its last viceroy and the (Redcliff) Award, deprived Pakistan of those territories which it would have been rightfully given. Later, Britain added to the sufferings of the Kashmiri people by maintaining a criminal silence over India's forcible occupation of Kashmir and never made a serious effort to help resolve this dispute between the Commonwealth member-states.

Now that the Kashmiri people have written a new history through sacrifices and have put India in a difficult situation, Britain, like the United States, has come to realize that the problem needs to be resolved; but the solution that they are offering is meant to shatter every remaining hope. If Pakistan becomes indifferent to the problem and the Kashmiri people's struggle is stopped in the name of external interference, then which power can force India to hold negotiations with the Kashmiri people as well as with Pakistan? This would be tantamount to strengthening India's occupation and silencing the Kashmiri people for good. Therefore, Pakistan and the Jammu and Kashmir should be spared of a solution which does not actually solve the problem. If Great Britain really wants a settlement of the Kashmir dispute, then it should press for the implementation of the UN resolutions instead of offering numerous suggestions. The British leadership is already aware that it is India which has been refusing to implement the UN resolutions, which has resulted in the escalation of tension in the region.

Commentary Previews Talks With India on Kashmir Issue

BK2711102793 Islamabad Radio Pakistan Network in English 1600 GMT 26 Nov 93

[Commentary by Mohammad Yamin]

[Text] According to the official announcements made on Wednesday in New Delhi and Islamabad, Pakistan and India are to resume bilateral talks on Jammu and Kashmir. The talks, that would open on 1 January next year, would be held in Islamabad at the level of foreign secretaries. The last talks between India and Pakistan at officials' level were held in New Delhi in August 1992. The joint statement regarding the January talks says clearly that all aspects of Jammu and Kashmir would be discussed. According to the Pakistan foreign office spokesman, several bilateral issues are to be discussed in the foreign secretaries' meeting, but Kashmir would be on the top of the agenda.

Describing the resumption of Indo-Pakistan dialogue as a small but a very significant step forward, Prime Minister Ms. Benazir Bhutto emphasized in the press conference yesterday that India had agreed to discuss Kashmir as a totally separate agenda item. It was already known and the prime minister reiterated that in response to the recent Indian overtures, Pakistan had made it amply clear that meaningful talks could not be undertaken in a vacuum and in order to have purposeful bilateral talks, it was imperative that Kashmir should be discussed as a distinct item of the agenda. India had now agreed to do so.

Pakistan had also made it quite plain that meaningful talks could not possibly be resumed unless and until the siege of Hazratbal Shrine was lifted and the new spate of violence and repression let loose in the occupied territory is brought to an end. The siege of Hazratbal Shrine has indeed come an end without the Indian occupation forces resorting to a bloodshed. But, it is yet to be seen whether India would show its good faith with a visible reduction in its repressive action against the innocent Kashmiris. More over, it is apparent that Pakistani authorities must have satisfied themselves that between now and the New Year, India would make earnest endeavor for creating a congenial atmosphere for the success of the negotiation. Pakistan on its side has shown significant good faith by responding positively to the Indian proposal for talks and has requested the friendly Muslim countries, who had planned to move a resolution in the United Nations on the Indian human rights violations in the held state, not to press the proposed motion in view of the forthcoming Indo-Pakistan dialogue.

For the last four years, Kashmiri struggle for freedom from the Indian bondage, which was launched as early as the Dogra ruler Hari Singh's deceitful accession to India and India's acceptance of it in somewhat indecent haste has received an unprecedented momentum. Thousands

of Kashmiri men, women, and children have been martyred during the renewed struggle and the Indian occupation forces have indulged in every conceivable abuse of human rights, wanton killings, gang rapes, looting, arson, mass arrests culminating in laying siege to Hazratbal Shrine where some freedom fighters were holed up along with a number of pilgrims. While the inmates of the shrine refused to come out, some of the protesters were martyred all over the occupied territory.

Prime Minister Ms. Benazir Bhutto in a [word indistinct] after her assumption of office in the wake of general elections participated in the Commonwealth summit conference at Limassol, Cyprus where she made a forceful projection of the Kashmiris just cause. Ever since the government of Pakistan has intensified the voicing of its moral, political, and diplomatic support for the Kashmiri freedom movement at all domestic and international fora [sentence as heard]. Resultantly, an increasing mention of Kashmir problem has found its place in the communication media throughout the world and India has come under increasing pressure to resolve the dispute through negotiations with Pakistan.

While it is hoped that the January talks between Pakistan and India would lay a solid foundation for a lasting peaceful settlement of the Kashmir dispute, there is one factor which cannot possibly be ignored. Pakistan is of course aware of the problem as it has experienced it so many times in its dealing with India who always uses the ploy of talks to gain time to get out of the difficult situation. It is up to the world at large (?to prevail) in its present pressure on India for the conclusion of a peaceful settlement of the unresolved question of Jammu and Kashmir.

Editorial Praises Return to Talks With India

BK2611120393 Islamabad THE NEWS in English 26 Nov 93 p 7

[Editorial: "Back to Talks"]

[Text] In a significant move Pakistan accepted on Wednesday the Indian offer to hold the seventh round of secretary level talks on "all aspects of the Kashmir issue." According to the Pakistan Foreign Office a formal invitation from Pakistan's Foreign Secretary, Sheharyar Khan, currently out of the country, will now be made to his Indian counterpart J.N. Dixit to visit Pakistan. The three-day talks will begin on January 1, 1994 in Islamabad.

In a press statement, Sardar Aseff Ahmed Ali, Pakistan's newly appointed Foreign Minister, explained Pakistan's position: "After having consulted some friendly countries and in view of the clarifications received from Indian government, our government has decided to accept the Indian offer of bilateral talks, including substantive discussions concerning a solution of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, in good faith and in the interest of peace and for the improvement of human rights situation." In another major decision Islamabad has also

deferred moving a resolution at the UN General Assembly condemning Indian human rights abuses in held Kashmir.

The resumption of the secretary-level talks is important to the extent that it will re-invigorate the process of dialogue that had been almost abandoned after six rounds of parleys between the two countries. But it is precisely this dismal record of previous attempts to negotiate a settlement of issues like the Kashmir dispute that raises doubts whether the seventh round would be any different from the 1st six. Obviously the government thinks that when the Indians sit round the negotiating table now, they will have to seriously address the Kashmir question, rather than beat about the bush. This assumption is premised on the Indian agreement for the first time to discuss the Kashmir issue as a separate agenda item. Also in the background is a chain of recent developments inside Kashmir, such as the Hazratbal siege, and the severe international censure Delhi has faced for its human rights abuses in the valley, all of which has left the Indians in a very difficult position. Official quarters argue, with some justification, that if Delhi could ever be forced to talk on Kashmir with some sincerity of purpose, it is now when, due to Pakistan's shrewd diplomacy and the sacrifices of the Kashmiri people themselves, the Indians are in a policy bind and world attention is focused on the Kashmir issue.

We hope that this assumption is correct and that Delhi has indeed been chastened by its experience in Kashmir as well as international pressure and has accepted the futility of the effort to colonise Kashmir for good. But considering that Delhi's diplomacy is another name for double-speak, Islamabad would do well to keep the Kashmir issue internationally alive. While there is no harm in entering another phase of dialogue with Delhi, Islamabad must not let India's misdeeds in Kashmir move out of the focus of the world community, notorious for its short attention span. In this regard, the government has acted correctly by reserving the right to move the UN resolution at the Human Rights Commission next February if the seventh round of talks again founders on the rock of Delhi's intransigence. If that happens Islamabad will have a better chance of winning the support of those western countries who were opposing the resolution on the grounds that this was a disincentive for Delhi to talk peace.

Editorial Sees 'Promise' for Outcome of Talks With India

BK2611140593 Karachi DAWN in English 26 Nov 93 p 11

[Editorial: "A Tiny Gleam in a Cloudy Sky"]

[Text] In the convoluted world of Pakistan-India relations there is always a need to be grateful for small mercies. It is in this spirit that the agreement by both sides to hold talks at the foreign secretaries' level in Islamabad on January 1 should be viewed. May the new

year when it comes have a beneficial effect upon their deliberations and, if nothing else, may it strip some of the thicker blinders which cloud the vision of the foreign policy establishments of the two sides preventing them from overcoming the rigidity which keeps their relationship in a frozen state at a time when so many problems across the globe have been unfrozen and resolved. Pinning the blame for this state of affairs on "both sides" is a form of ritualism in which we are indulging in order to covey an impression of even-handedness, although, if the truth be told, the onus for the ill winds still blowing across this region must be pinned squarely on India's broad shoulders.

The one issue which bedevils Pakistan-India relations is Kashmir, a land whose troubles, both old and new, spring from the saga of violence and hatred which India has chosen to write over it. Since talking is infinitely better than being locked in an endless stalemate, every right-thinking person in Pakistan will welcome the January talks in Islamabad. But any optimism that may be attached to them cannot alter the circumstance that unless India is prepared to respect the wishes of the Kashmiri people, there can be no solution to this crisis.

Still, the January talks are significant in that India after a long time has agreed to bring the Kashmir dispute "in all its aspects" under discussion. Considering its hand-in-the-ground approach of the recent past, this already is progress even if Pakistan has learnt the hard way not to put too much faith in olive branches held out by India. New Delhi has always entered into negotiations over Kashmir not out of choice but because of compelling circumstances. So it is this time. If it were not for the adverse publicity that India has received because of its human rights record in Kashmir, especially in the wake of the Hazratbal siege, and if it were not for the renewed American interest in Kashmir as expressed by the recent State Department remarks which miffed India so much, it is doubtful if India would have been prepared to swallow the bitter pill of agreeing to hold talks on Kashmir.

Even as it is, there will be widespread scepticism in Pakistan that India will use the talks merely as a respite and return to its stonewalling ways once the focus of world opinion shifts elsewhere. All the same, Pakistan need be under no illusion about any dramatic resolution of the Kashmir dispute. Any progress on it is bound to be slow, testing not so much the patience of Pakistan as of the people of Kashmir, who, by their sufferings and their courage in facing up to the Indian occupation, have put life into an issue that India and also many people in Pakistan had come to consider as dead. Thus, any opportunity that crops up for taking the peaceful resolution of the Kashmir problem a step further should be grabbed with both hands and explored for all it is worth. Even if no one in Pakistan is foolish enough to entertain any exaggerated hopes about the January talks, the point remains that it is in the interests both of Pakistan and the long-suffering people of Kashmir to see India locked in a

diplomatic effort which even if it does not yield immediate results, holds out the promise of something positive at the remote end of it. Just as no one could have imagined the Berlin Wall being torn down or the PLO Chairman shaking hands with the Israeli prime minister,

so it is not without reason to hope that sooner or later what today is hard to imagine with regard to Kashmir will also come to pass. The point is to keep trying, something which Pakistan will surely be doing when the January talks get under way.

Article Exposes 'Myths' About Kashmir
BK0411032193 Delhi INDIAN EXPRESS in English
27 Oct 93 p 8

[By G. M. Telang]

[Text] Today marks the 46th anniversary of the accession of J&K [Jammu & Kashmir] to the India Union and the despatch of India troops to Srinagar to save it from a Pakistan invading force. The obvious question it raises is: Will a new Indo-Pakistan summit on this conflict following Benazir Bhutto's assumption of office as the Prime Minister be any different from the many unsuccessful ones in the past? It is the Pakistani rulers rigidity so far that has blocked a bilateral or UN-mediated settlement. This attitude can be best described as partition fundamentalism. It has led to an aversion in Pakistan to testing its claim to Kashmir on the touch stone either of legality or democracy or logic or political realism. It is simply because Mohammed Ali Jinnah decided that Kashmir must be a part of Pakistan that his desire subsequently turned into a national dogma. Understandably, the first-generation Pakistanis seemed to regard it virtually as treason even to think of a serious review of their government's stand on Kashmir. Much will now depend upon whether Benazir Bhutto's government will be flexible enough not to regard an old ambition cherished in different circumstances as an immutable doctrine.

The Pakistani force which crossed into Kashmir on October 22 comprised of regular troops in disguise, Mahsuds and Afridis from NWFP [North-West Frontier Province] and others and was led by army officers. It was a little later that Pakistan admitted this. Despite this, the fact is often overlooked in attempts to find out what went wrong in Kashmir. The invaders, after an unopposed thrust, accompanied by pillage and murder were about to seize Srinagar. It was then that the Maharaja of J&K stopped dithering about the future of the state and signed the Instrument of Accession to India. Only after this, Indian troops were airlifted to the Kashmir capital.

The first myth, namely, that New Delhi had manipulated the Hindu Maharaja to extract the accession was born of deliberate Pakistani distortion of the fact that accession was a response to aggression and not vice versa. The truth is that he was extremely reluctant to make J&K a part of the just emerged free India unlike most other rulers of the erstwhile princely states. It is well known that he was toying with the idea, until the last moment, of making J&K an Asian Switzerland. What is more, the Sheikh Abdul'ah-led National Conference of J&K N [National] the party which was heading the popular movement against the Maha aja's rule N was strongly opposed to the incorporation of the state into Pakistan. The NC's [National Conference] rival, Muslim Conference, patronised by Jinnah, had hardly any support in the valley. At one stage Jinnah had even sought to strike a deal with the Maharaja (as with the Maharaja of Jodhpur too while the Maharaja of Travancore, egged on

by his Dewan, C. P Ramaswamy Iyer, had even declared independence and the latter had held talks with Jinnah for some sort of an alliance). This was part of a bizarre transition after the end of the British paramountcy over the princely states. The Kashmir problem arose during this turbulence.

It is because this was not fully realised in the West that Pakistani propaganda on Kashmir often appeared to have made some headway there. Any understanding of the Kashmir conflict is bound to be flawed if, in particular, it is not appreciated, that Jinnah first tried to cultivate the Maharaja of J&K and then gave the green signal for the invasion of the state with the primary purpose of outmanoeuvring Sheikh Abdullah and the National Conference. The invasion, besides, was a blatant violation of the Standstill Agreement between the Maharaja and India and Pakistan.

The other myth which Pakistani propaganda has sedulously fostered is about Pakistan's interest in giving the right of self-determination to Kashmir. This exercise has involved an attempt to keep the Pakistani people, not to mention the rest of the world, in the dark about the truth in this regard. Here is what G. M. Sadiq, a close colleague of Sheikh Abdullah's in the National Conference, has disclosed. According to him, prior to the Pakistani invasion, the Conference deputed him to Pakistan where he pleaded with its leaders "to recognise the democratic rights of the people for self-determination and to abide by the sovereign will of a free people on the question of association with either of the Dominions (India or Pakistan). I met Pakistan's Prime Minister and other ministers. But it was of no use." Bakshi Ghulam Mohamed, another stalwart of the NC, asserted in November 1947: "The Pakistani leaders were unwilling to let the Kashmir issue be decided by a referendum. The Pakistani leaders were reported to have said that unless Sheikh Abdullah pledged to Pakistan that the NC would solidly vote for the State's accession to Pakistan, they could not agree to a referendum. That suggestion was totally unacceptable to the National Conference."

It was this hatred Pakistan had for the true leaders of Kashmir that was behind the stubborn Pakistani rejection of all the UN attempts in the fifties at demilitarisation of Kashmir to prepare the ground for a plebiscite. Pakistan's policy ever since has been to hold on to the western parts of Kashmir already seized by its army and to grab the valley and other parts through war or by plunging them in endless terrorist violence (the standoff at Hazratbal Mosque in Srinagar being the latest facet of this design). If the entire course of the Kashmir problem through the UN shows anything, it is that unless the Pakistan government is willing to give up the dogma that it is its birthright to annex Kashmir, there will be no solution.

The Shimla Accord of 1972 likewise was meaningless unless it was meant precisely to open the way for a via media demanded as much by the dismal background traced above as by the entirely new power configuration

in the sub-continent. The Accord has not so far yielded what was expected of it precisely, because Pakistan has paid only lip-service to it while leaving no stone unturned to sabotage it. A dialogue between Benazir Bhutto and P. V. Narasimha Rao will be worthwhile only if she is serious about breaking the stalemate over genuine implementation of the accord as the basis for a bilateral settlement. No one knows how free she is in taking a decision in this regard. This is because it is the Inter-Service Intelligence [ISI] which has so far dictated and executed the Pakistani strategy on Kashmir. The possibility of the Hazratbal tension and the firing the other day on protesters in Bijbehara being used by the ISI to scuttle any conciliatory move cannot, therefore, be ruled out. If this is a major challenge, the external environment also presents her with a new opportunity to take a firm step towards a mutually acceptable solution.

Editorial Urges Government To 'Expose' Pakistani 'Designs'

BK0411141393 Bombay NAVBHARAT TIMES in Hindi 27 Oct 93 p 4

[Editorial: "Expose Pakistan"]

[Text] The news that India and Pakistan have agreed to a secretary-level dialogue has come as a silver lining in the dark clouds. Where and how soon this dialogue will take place is irrelevant for the time being. The next round of suspended talks was to take place in Pakistan, but that is not important now. Second, in view of the state assembly elections in India, the scheduled G-15 meeting in New Delhi and India's occupation with the UNICEF-sponsored eight-nation conference on population, it does not look like that the secretary-level talks could be held before January next year. The differences between India and Pakistan are widening daily, and it speaks of wisdom in both countries that in spite of alerting the armed forces, war sirens are not being sounded. That is why the dialogue should take place as soon as possible.

In fact, these days wars do not solve any problem. They rather complicate things, and a victor or vanquished eventually has to enter into a dialogue. This fact should fully dawn on Pakistan who has been working overtime to act like a wolf in sheep's clothing simply because we returned to it the land won [during the 1965 war] under the Tashkent Agreement. Even now an enormous amount of goodwill has been expressed on our behalf and our Prime Minister Narasimha Rao, while sending a message of congratulations to Benazir Bhutto, expressed a desire for dialogue which has been accepted in principle. Diplomacy does not run in such a straightforward manner, however. A hand of friendship is extended, but with conditions attached to it. Pakistan says that unless Indian troops are not withdrawn from all around the Hazratbal shrine, no talks will be held with India. The very first meeting of Benazir Bhutto's cabinet passed a resolution putting the Armed Forces on red alert and it is being said that as soon as the Parliament meets, a

resolution condemning India will be adopted which will also ask India to withdraw its troops from Hazratbal shrine. It is their Parliament, they can do whatever they like, but to counter all this we have to revive the anti-Pakistan campaign. It is no longer a secret to anyone that Pakistan is not only extending all kinds of assistance to the militants, but it has also sent Afghan mojahedin and mercenaries into Kashmir.

We should be diligent in exposing the Pakistani designs. If Benazir Bhutto is intent upon raising the Kashmir issue in all forums, in retaliation we should take the offensive instead of adopting a defensive posture. Benazir Bhutto not only raised the Kashmir issue at Cyprus [Commonwealth Summit], but while the foreign secretaries of the two countries were preparing the groundwork for India-Pakistan dialogue, Pakistan's new Foreign Minister Farooq Ahmed Leghari was raising the Kashmir issue at the same time in the adjoining chamber at the summit. This is Pakistan's diplomacy—try to grab for the throat with one hand while extending another for friendship. Our diplomacy should be to see that Pakistan extends both hands for friendship. We should also encourage a visit to India by the Pakistani cricket team, which is hesitating to come in view of the present atmosphere and its past unseemly behavior. In fact, Pakistani rulers are more hesitant than players who do not want people from two countries to mix with each other. Pakistan has also discouraged many potential visitors to India by its unfortunate order asking many Indian diplomats to leave Pakistan. The dialogue should go on, but people from both side should also mix with each other.

Former Governor Cautions U.S. Over Kashmir Policy

BK0511002493 Delhi INDIAN EXPRESS in English 30 Oct 93 p 11

[Text] New Delhi—Former Jammu and Kashmir Governor Girish Chandra Saxena has cautioned the United States that any attempt to "cajole" or pressurise India beyond a point would "only complicate and prolong the type of the situation that prevails in Kashmir." In an interview here on Friday Saxena referred to the recent utterances of American opinion leaders. He opined that these would not have a helpful and positive impact on India's efforts to resolve the problem politically.

Saxena's views are significant given the fact that as the former boss of the formidable Research and Analysis Wing he handled many international intricacies.

The former Governor referred to the mention about Kashmir made by US President Bill Clinton in his speech in the United Nations General Assembly and by Robin Raphel, US Assistant Secretary of State, in her recent utterances. He said Clinton was not expected to include in his speech in the UN "anything in casual way and in passing".

The name of Kashmir just did not figure incidentally. It does indicate that it has entered his mind as one of the problems of interest to the US," he remarked. "Similarly," he stated, "the statements of Raphael have to be analysed and a watch needs to be kept on further pronouncements or moves as a follow-up."

The former RAW [Research and Analysis Wing (Intelligence Agency)] chief felt that the correct response to these developments was "to make the concerned major powers aware of the background and complexities of the connected issues to make them understand that you have very vital interests and high stakes in the matter."

His experience was that most powers knew that where their own vital interests were involved the concerned countries "hardly give an inch".

He said the major powers had to realise "on the basis of information that they can themselves obtain through their own agencies" that the "stakes for India go beyond territorial and security issues and pose a serious threat to the integrity and unity of the country and character and structure of the secular base of India's polity and society."

On its part, Saxena felt, India should be sensitive to the "legitimate concerns of major powers in our part of the world and carry on a constructive dialogue with these powers on a bilateral footing".

He brought into sharp focus the role of Pakistan and human rights organisations. He ridiculed Pakistan's attempts to exploit concern shown by some major powers about a possible armed conflict between India and Pakistan and project that Kashmir might provide the flashpoint for such an eventuality. He asserted that it was "a mere propaganda ploy"

He said there was hardly any likelihood of a war unless Pakistan started one or added a new dimension to its involvement in Kashmir and terrorist activities elsewhere in India with the deliberate aim of triggering a war. He hoped that Pakistan would "not embark upon such a suicidal course."

Another issue that Pakistan exploited related to human rights. Saxena asserted that those talking or writing about the problems of human rights in Kashmir must only be aware that the problem arose from the actions of Pakistan which was conducting a proxy war in Kashmir. He said these activists should be aware that Pakistan was playing up the theme of human rights violations as a part of "its well-planned sustained campaign to internationalise the issue."

He pointed out that with Pakistan's designs and the militancy in the valley largely contained on the ground, "its hope and effort was now concentrated on bringing about international mediation or intervention while keeping up the sagging morale of the militants.

Article Assails U.S. India Policy

BK1011061293 Delhi *INDIAN EXPRESS* in English
31 Oct 93 p 15

[By Arati R. Jerath]

[Text] By questioning the accession of Kashmir to the Indian Union, United States Assistant Secretary of State Robin Raphael appears to have in one stroke nullified the goodwill, so painstakingly built up by both governments in the past two-and-a-half years of thaw.

Not only have her unfortunate and ill-timed remarks given a fillip to anti-US lobbies here, they have hardened positions across the board, in official as well as political and other circles, which even some aggressive damage limitation steps will find difficult to neutralise.

The immediate fallout of the sudden downslide in Indo-US relations is likely to be an indefinite postponement of the summit level meeting between Prime Minister Narasimha Rao and President Bill Clinton, scheduled for early next year.

The meeting was to have been the springboard for India and the US to move closer, the spadework for which was done by the Foreign Secretary in Washington last month and later, an official team which went to the US to clear the air on the non-proliferation issue.

Instead, the US Administration, with its intemperate comments on Kashmir, has left the Government with little room for manoeuvrability on the major pressure points in Indo-US relations, particularly Kashmir and the indigenous nuclear and missile programmes, all of which are highly sensitive subjects in India.

Such statements by the US are counter-productive," notes Jasjit Singh, Director of the Institute of Defence and Strategic Analysis. "Over-pressure only encourage militancy."

Washington's latest bombshell has hit the Government hard, particularly since the controversial statement was made by Raphael herself, who is directly responsible for framing and implementing US policy on South Asia.

Diplomatic observers here feel that her off-the-cuff remarks—and there were several that hurt, ranging from her virtually letting Pakistan off the hook on the terrorism question to the "discriminatory" nature of the Pressler Amendment to not recognising the validity of the Instrument of Accession—only underline the inexperience in handling the job into which she was pitchforked with several out-of-turn promotions.

At the same time, grave doubts are beginning to surface here about Washington's intentions in the face of the bewildering flip-flops by the US Administration in recent months.

From former Interim Director John Malott's controversial warnings on India's human rights record in Kashmir to getting the cryogenic rocket deal with Russia scrapped

to making a demarche demanding that the Agni and Prithvi missile programmes be scrapped to describing the Simla Agreement as "ineffective" to President Clinton clubbing Kashmir along with Angola and the Caucasus, Washington has first needled and then quickly backtracked, spreading confusion in both India and Pakistan with its ad hoc attempts at even-handedness.

The US Administration's reply to the Indian Government's demarche on Raphel's statement is expected early next week. Observers here feel that once again Washington will try to contain the damage with an ambiguous retraction. But it cannot renege from its stated position of Kashmir being a disputed territory.

At best then, the Clinton Administration can try to smoothen out its diplomatic dealings with India which have taken wild swings in recent months.

Unfortunately, there is a vast and influential public opinion to be dealt with in a democracy like India and US actions since Clinton assumed an interest in foreign policy matters have increasingly embittered this important segment.

Observers feel that while this has certainly made it difficult for the Government to take flexible positions on controversial issues there is a hidden bonus in the latest storm—that India's bottom line has become self-evident in the unanimous outcry Raphel's comments have provoked.

For the US, these developments can only cause concern. After Clinton's misadventures in Somalia and Haiti, the US Administration cannot hope to get US public opinion to support a military or economic commitment, in South Asia to sort out Indo-Pak tensions over Kashmir. And it is slowly but surely losing its diplomatic leverage in New Delhi with its patchy India policy.

Editorial Criticizes U.S. Policy on Kashmir
*BK1611103193 Calcutta ANANDABAZAR PATRIKA
 in Bengali 1 Nov 93 p 4*

[Editorial: "Audacious and Unrestrained Comments"]

[Text] Just a year back during the campaign for the U.S. presidential elections, President George Bush remarked that Bill Clinton is contesting for the highest office, but he does not understand foreign policy at all. During that time of electoral battle many rival candidates passed hostile comments against each other. But Mr. Clinton has won the election and taken over the charge of the White House. During the last one year period, the officials of the State Department through their comments and behavior have proved that there is some substance in what George Bush said about Bill Clinton during the election campaign. The chief executive cannot avoid responsibility of the official statements made by bureaucrats. Apart from this, the wrong policies

adopted by the Clinton administration in less controversial areas like Bosnia, Haiti, and Somalia also prove that these policies lack firm conviction and farsightedness.

For a long time India has expressed resentment against the U.S. policy toward the subcontinent. Though the United States claims that it is the champion of democracy, all along it has been supporting Pakistan, where democracy does not exist at all. Many governments came to power in Pakistan since the assassination of its first prime minister, Liaquat Ali Khan. However, until now the main seat of power in that country has been the army barracks, and it has never gone into the hands of the representatives of the people. The miserable fate suffered by Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto has proved what can be the outcome if politicians try to assert their power. Bhutto's daughter Benazir has become the prime minister of that country after the popular elections held recently. However, it would be ignorance to say that the military officials of that country have now given up their grip on power. Whatever may be the case, this is an internal affair of that country. It is a fact that the U.S. Administration feels comfortable in dealing with foreign governments that are headed by dictators and autocratic military rulers. Washington does not want to trust democratic governments, particularly those who follow an independent policy. India is suffering due to the excessive love of the United States for Pakistan. It is true that the United States is not giving much importance to Pakistan after the collapse of the former Soviet Union. Pakistan has recently been chided by the United States on various accounts. After Clinton came to power, his officials have also been making attempts to criticize India on various charges. They do not bother to see whether they are crossing the limits of diplomatic norms or not.

Recently, the U.S. assistant secretary of state, Ms. Robin Raphel, addressing reporters in Washington, said that the United States does not recognize that "Kashmir is an integral part of India." She further said that the U.S. Government does not accept the Instrument of Accession in accordance with which Kashmir became a part of India. Who cares whether the United States accepts the laws drafted during the partition of India or not. It would not be proper to claim that the policy of the Indian Government has always been flawless. There are many critics of the government's Kashmir policy in India itself. Some people allege that human rights are being violated in Kashmir. However, this should also be taken into consideration that militancy is gradually on the rise in the state. The militants are creating law and order situation and provoking the religious minded people. The militants aim at destabilizing the government, and Pakistan is providing all-out assistance to them. The encouragement of Pakistan is also responsible for the capture of the Hazratbal Shrine by the militants. Of course, New Delhi is worried about the Hazratbal Shrine incident. The government is alert so that the militants are not able to spread the communal venom among the people. Those who want peace should display a sense of

responsibility. The militants do not care for it. Now the question arises as to whether Pakistan and the United States want restoration of peace or not. At this crisis moment, it is the duty of every responsible person to display restraint and cautiousness. Why did Ms. Raphael issue a controversial statement at this moment? This lady is not unaware that such statements can disturb peace in the valley. A senior official of the State Department should not display such stupidity. A probe should be made to ascertain why the United States instead of exerting pressure on Pakistan to stop aiding militants is making efforts to put India into greater danger.

U.S. Thinking on Kashmir Termed 'Scandalously Shocking'

BK1011063693 Delhi INDIAN EXPRESS in English 1 Nov 93 p 8

[Editorial: "Mischievous and Hostile"]

[Text] Coming at the time it has, the statement by the US State Department official, Robin Raphael, that the whole of Kashmir was disputed territory, is irresponsible and mischievous. It is tantamount to a deliberate attempt to aggravate the crisis triggered by the occupation of the Hazratbal shrine by Kashmiri terrorists. In this sense, it is in the nature of hostile interference in a matter internal to India. Not just that, it will encourage Pakistan to step up its assistance to terrorists. The argument that Robin Raphael's statement should be dismissed as yet another of the foot-in-the-mouth variety for which US diplomats are notorious, will not wash. The newly appointed head of the US State Department's South Asian Bureau has the reputation of having studied the Kashmir issue closely, especially during her two-year tenure until recently as the Political Counsellor in the US Embassy in Delhi. Surely, she could not have goofed it so badly on her own. Her statement, seen in the context of several others of its kind—including President Clinton's celebrated one—recently, clearly reflects the thinking of the US State Department. This is precisely what makes it so scandalously shocking. It indicates a contempt for constitutional documents which is totally inconsistent with the US political culture which attaches the highest importance to constitutionalism.

This is why the Indian protest note has pertinently asked the US whether it is questioning the validity of the Indian Independence Act as the accession of Kashmir emanated out of it. If Robin Raphael's and the US State Department's understanding of the constitutional issues that came to the fore in 1947 is as shallow as indicated by her curious observation, then they may blithely dismiss this question as nothing but legal quibbling. The integral connection between the Instrument of Accession and all that has followed in the last four decades means nothing to her and her government. Her dismissive remark that the Simla Accord has not been effective and the implied inference that it is, therefore, best forgotten smacks of an amateurish approach to a crucial event.

It is really extraordinary especially for a high official of a country committed to a war on international terrorism that she should be unaware that Pakistan exported terrorism to Kashmir precisely to sabotage the Simla Accord. She has harped on the theme of ascertaining the wishes of the Kashmiris. If she had read and assimilated what Josef Korbel, a member of the UN Commission on India and Pakistan and Sir Owen Dixon, another UN mediator on Kashmir had to say about the difficulties and pitfalls of a plebiscite, she might have done better.

Government Urged To Resist U.S. 'Pressure' Over Kashmir

BK1511121693 Delhi INDIAN EXPRESS in English 9 Nov 93 p 8

[Editorial: "Washington's Double-speak"]

[Text] It is clearly the unanimity and intensity of the protest in India against Robin Raphael's mischievous statement on Kashmir which has led to the recent clarification by her boss, United States' Under Secretary of State, Peter Tarnoff. Raphael had dismissed the Simla Agreement as ineffective and questioned that the Instrument of Accession meant that Kashmir would "for evermore be an integral part of India." Tarnoff, on the other hand, stated in response to a letter by the Indian Ambassador to Washington that negotiations between India and Pakistan under the Simla Agreement provided "the best means for resolving their dispute over Kashmir." It will, however, be foolish on the part of the Indian authorities to believe that Tarnoff's remark means an abandonment of the United States' frequently-displayed tilt in Pakistan's favour on Kashmir. It signifies nothing more than a tactical reformulation of its stand to mute the angry outbursts in India. This is clear from his disguised reiteration of Pakistan's demand for a plebiscite in Kashmir in his remark, "As a practical matter we believe this process of bilateral negotiations need to take into account the wishes of the Kashmiri people."

In the elections that have regularly taken place in Jammu and Kashmir since its accession to India, people have repeatedly voted into power in the State political parties and leaders who have unambiguously stated the view that Kashmir was an integral part of India, that its accession to this country was irreversible. Tarnoff clearly does not believe that this reflects the wishes of the Kashmiri people. If he thought so, he would not have talked about taking their wishes into account. His remark therefore implies that some other way has to be found for ascertaining their wishes. In other words, plebiscite. This is a position which India cannot accept and which is hardly in keeping with the spirit of the Simla Agreement.

Far from being complacent, New Delhi should prepare to cope with the next move by the US which, remarkably, refuses to do anything effective to stop Pakistan's sponsorship of terrorism in Kashmir and Punjab. The

best way of doing so would be to demonstrate clearly that India will not be pressured by any country, including the US, to compromise its sovereignty over Kashmir and that it has the political will and national determination to hold its own. And the clearest demonstration of this will be the enunciation of a comprehensive Kashmir policy, based on consultation with all political parties and therefore representing the national will, and its resolute implementation. It is New Delhi's weakness and vacillation in handling the Kashmir situation, exemplified most glaringly by the manner in which the Hazarbal siege has been conducted, which has clearly encouraged the US to believe that a little pressure will force India to surrender.

Kashmir Turmoil, Alienation Attributed to Government Policy

Government Indecisive

94AS0073A New Delhi JANSATTA in Hindi
9-10 Nov 93 p 4

[Article by Jawaharlal Kaul: "Delhi's Uncertainty Is the Actual Problem"]

[Text] Independent India is passing through a very difficult period now. Socio-political tension is a natural outcome of change. However, this tense situation developed because of dependence on others in the economic area and emergence of new equations at the international level and point toward a much serious danger. India's isolation over the Kashmir issue did not occur all of a sudden. We have to look at it alongside other issues. Increasing pressure on India over the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, limiting missile development, and imposition of additional restrictions over economic aid are not unrelated issues. In order to understand the real importance related to this critical situation, we must review the mistakes we made after our independence and how those mistakes are responsible for the present situation. We can find a viable solution for the present and make future plans only after we have understood our past mistakes.

It is clear now that it was a mistake on our part to establish separate standards for Kashmir. Our leaders suffered delusions about Tibet also. Our first prime minister was a leader with a dream. However, his dream did not have a solid base. In his romantic dream, he had visualized that the imperialist system will be followed by a better world under the socialist system. He was so impressed with this idea that he even believed that countries that had become socialist could not become imperialist. This belief persuaded him to sacrifice Tibet when dealing with China. By accepting Chinese control over Tibet, Nehru not only created a grave danger for India but also moved India many rungs below China in Asia.

India was not forced to accept Chinese control over Tibet at that time. The communist regime in China was

established two years after India's independence. China was not superior to India either in economics or in the military area. Had the Indian leaders seriously considered our national interests and earnestly analyzed the possible political developments, they would have concluded that Tibet's remaining an independent nation was in India's best interest. Chinese control over Tibet would be dangerous for us. The result of this action came in the form of Chinese military attack on India and India's embarrassing defeat in 1962. Even though Nehru's dream was broken by this jolt, he still was not prepared to resolve this issue logically. The prime minister, after appealing to the U.S. President John Kennedy and having him threaten China with American interference, totally failed to form an effective future strategy. He did not perceive the impracticality of his plans even when the Chinese soldiers took over a large part of Jammu-Kashmir after killing Indian soldiers in Laddakh even before the main attack. In response to criticism in the Parliament, Nehru had said that even a blade of grass did not grow in that place. The legislator had then asked, "Since I do not have even one strand of hair on my head, should I be ready to have it cut?"

Had India supported Tibetan independence from the very beginning, Tibet would be acting as a defense buffer between India and China now. Tibet got its independence in 1947, and within the next 10 years would have attained a position with India's help and international support that China could not have undone. We should have remembered that our borders in north and east meet with Tibet and not China. If India, Bhutan, Nepal, and Bangladesh are south of the Himalayas, then Tibet is north of them. Tibet is the source of most of the great rivers, including the Indus and the Brahmaputra, that flow in this Subcontinent. Even more important than this is the fact that Jammu and Kashmir share a border with Tibet. It is Tibet through which the route to central Asian countries goes. If the 'buffer zone' of Tibet was there, the Kashmir problem would not have become so complicated. After the 1947 attack, Pakistan was able to occupy Balti-speaking Skardu in Gilgit because Tibet was not independent. One aspect of the Kashmir problem now is that China is very interested in its western part. This area is very important for reaching central Asia. The Korakoram highway was built next to Skardu for this reason. The Chinese have built a highway in Nepal that reaches India's border. Our mistakes over Tibet have made India psychologically a midget, and have also created this situation of India being surrounded by other country's armies.

At the same time, India had its hands severed over Kashmir. Not only did India delay annexing Kashmir, it made two crucial mistakes after the Pakistani attack. The Indian army did not have much problem in routing the Pakistani soldiers, however, while accepting the cease-fire order from the United Nations, it did not push the enemy soldiers to a safe distance. The cease-fire announcement was made without taking Indian military experts into confidence. The military officers who were

in command at the Kashmir front believe that even if they had been given one more day, they would have pushed the Control Line to Domel on Kishan Ganga, two miles before Muzaffarabad, as well as having Karen Valley being on our side of the border in Kupwara. It should be kept in mind that the terrorists have infiltrated Kashmir mostly from this valley.

In addition to this costly mistake on the military front, India itself promised to hold a referendum in Kashmir. This promise made in the United Nations is still proving a thorn in India's side. India made Kashmir an issue by this assurance and created the opportunity of questioning Kashmir's merger with India. Pakistan has raised this question repeatedly and the United States has started to discuss it publicly because of its national interests. It would have been easier to merge Kashmir if India had not suggested holding a referendum. When Robin Raphael says that the United States has always considered Kashmir a disputed issue, she points to this very fatal assurance India had given. Similarly, the temporary arrangement under Article 370 became so complicated that it gave the Kashmiri politicians an opportunity to dream up an 'independent Kashmir' and offer this option to the people there.

The third dreadful option being offered by the United States was also made possible by this situation. During his first term, Sheikh Abdullah was trying to make this concept acceptable. In 1952, when disagreement occurred between Sheikh Abdullah and the Indian government, a U.S. observer suggested the idea of an Azad Kashmir to Sheikh Abdullah. Sheikh Abdullah was arrested in 1953 when the Indian government got wind of this conspiracy. At this point, the leaders of the National Conference organized the 'front for a referendum.' Mirza Afzal Baig, Sheikh's close associate, was its president. Sheikh Abdulla himself became its patron and his son-in-law Gul Shah held an important position in it. Interestingly, even after talking about holding a referendum, Sheikh Abdullah and his son-in-law Ghulam Mohammed Shah became Kashmir's chief ministers. Even after the front for holding a referendum was broken up, the desire for the referendum never left Kashmiri politics. It resurfaced in the front of Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front (JKLF).

All groups have different opinions about the referendum. Sheikh Abdullah and Amanullah Khan had agreed that the referendum should be held with three options: Jammu-Kashmir could join Pakistan, India or remain independent. Both wanted Kashmir to be independent. Pakistan wanted the decision to be between India and itself. Pakistan does not accept the idea of an independent Kashmir at all. India says that a referendum can be held only when Pakistan vacates the areas of Kashmir it is now occupying. As for the Kashmir valley, Jammu, and Laddakh, the people have showed support for India in many elections. Now the United States has opened the so-called third option!

The third option is to leave so-called Azad Kashmir in Pakistan, Jammu and Laddakh in India, and let the Kashmir Valley and Gilgit be an independent nation. The United States calls Kashmir a disputed region on the one side, and at the same time suggests resolving the issue according to the Shimla Pact instead of holding a referendum. These ideas appear to be contradictory, but in fact are not. The United States wants India and Pakistan to start talks just like the Arab-Israel talks. This can lead to understanding by making some compromises. The ideas for compromise will also come from the United States, and these will suggest that the Kashmir valley and Gilgit becoming independent nations. Why does the United States want to divide Kashmir into three parts instead of the whole Jammu-Kashmir region joining either India or Pakistan?

We have to keep two things in mind to understand this. The first is the geographical location of Kashmir and the second is the changing political equation in the world. The Kashmir valley and Gilgit share a border with Tibet. They are also close to the Afghanistan border. If Pakistan-occupied Skardu is included, it joins central Asia to the sub-continent. It joins Punjab and Himachal Pradesh of India via Jammu on one side and Pakistani Punjab via Muzaffarabad. In other words, it is like a junction or crossroad. This geographic fact has made this region very important in the changing political equation in the world. Even though the United States is the only superpower now, China still is a major hindrance in establishing U.S. supremacy in Asia. The Chinese challenge cannot be countered just by economic sanctions. The United States depends on China for its vast market as much as China depends on the United States. Therefore, it is important for the United States to keep a close eye on the internal situation in Kashmir. The political map of Central Asia has changed after the fall of the Soviet Union. The U.S. intrusion into this region has become essential, not only because it is a future market, but also in order to limit Iran's influence.

There is no better place than Kashmir for this purpose. An independent nation that is not only dependent on the United States for its economy but also accepts U.S. armed forces support for its defense will be there. This will actually be a U.S. military base. This will help the United States realize many other goals also. After giving India and Pakistan part of the region, it can tell them that they do not need new weapons now that the Kashmir issue has been resolved. The pressure on India to stop its missile program and plans to make cryogenic engines might increase. Both countries can be required to sign the NPT. It can assure India about the Chinese danger by saying that the United States is keeping an eye on it and can provide defense shield to India in case of an attack. Its dream of supervising India and Pakistan will be realized.

The question is: Can India risk ignoring this conspiracy with long-term effects? If not, it must learn from its earlier mistakes. For example, if we believe that Kashmir is a part of India, we must refuse interference by a third

party in this context. It should be made clear that any country that talks about dividing up Kashmir is endangering its relationship with India. The talks should be limited to freeing the so-called Azad Kashmir. It should be kept in mind that it is not only the United States that is making noise about this third option. There are some people in our country who want to go back to the 1947 situation. The recent statement of the former Kashmiri president gives indirect support to this group. We should not encourage such self-appointed leaders.

Delhi's Indecisiveness

It would be helpful to review some facts about Kashmir. Kashmir has become an subject of contention because of India's mistakes. One aspect of this dispute is the danger in the Kashmir valley itself and the second is the anti-Indian atmosphere at the international level. The fact that both these aspects are interdependent is important and the picture is not complete without both. For example, it became an international issue after the Pakistani attack and discussions in the United Nations and the assurance of holding a referendum. There was no internal danger in Kashmir at that time. The people in the Kashmir valley did not take the Pakistani claim seriously. However, in the years that followed, an internal problem arose in Jammu and Laddakh mostly because of the vested interests of Kashmiri leaders and partly because of Pakistani propaganda. Now after 45 years, it is not the success of Pakistani diplomatic efforts but rather India's failure to resolve the internal conflict that has made Kashmir an explosive issue. If the terrorists were not so active in Kashmir now and if the prestige of the Indian and the Kashmir governments was not so low, then Pakistan would not have been so successful in internationalizing this issue and the Western vested interests would not have had this open opportunity to come out and make their play. Therefore, though we may discuss both these facets separately, we cannot deny the fact that both of these are complementary.

Pakistan says that Kashmir is related to the unfinished division of the subcontinent. In other words, Kashmir should go to Pakistan based on the religion of its people. This belief of Pakistan did not affect the Kashmiri Muslims much in the beginning. The important aspect in this context is that only one party, the Muslim Conference, represented the pro-Pakistan group in Kashmir in those days. However, the atmosphere was so antagonistic toward this party that its principal leader, Moulvi Yusuf Shah, had to flee to Pakistan leaving his very important position as imam mir waiz [head moulvi] of Jama Masjid. The duties of mir waiz fell on the minor shoulders of Moulvi Farooq. He had no political position. However, the problems in Kashmir were not started by the pro-Pakistani groups; these were started by the pro-Indian leadership who wanted the Indian Constitution out of Kashmir from the very beginning. The distance between Kashmir and the rest of India created a confrontational situation between the Kashmiri rulers

and the Indian government which even Jawaharlal Nehru and Sheikh Abdullah's personal friendship could not keep suppressed.

This distance in relationship had long-range results. Kashmir was kept separate from Indian legal, tax, and election systems in the beginning. This led to an autocratic rule there in the name of democracy. This rule was not that of a welfare state either. This is clear from the inertia in the areas of industrialization and economic development in Jammu-Kashmir. No industrial development effort has ever been successful in Kashmir valley yet. Let us forget heavy industries, even small and medium scale industries declined there gradually. The fact is that Kashmir just did not have any economic development plan. There was no strategic plan behind any development work. Very little progress was made and that too mostly because of need-based grants from the Indian government. It is clear that such a situation creates a large group of vested interests which is usually outside the democratic laws.

Mental malice towards India began to increase because the stability of the vested interests' rule depended on this feeling. It naturally effected the Hindu-majority Jammu and the Buddhist Laddakh. There regions were not only unsatisfied because of the imbalance in government but also because they were cut off from Kashmiri leadership due to their complaints against the government. This led to a rebellion-like situation. The Kashmir rulers, instead of using logical plans and democratic process, used religious emotions to fight this situation. After Sheikh Abdullah was arrested in 1953, the process of implementing Indian constitution in Kashmir was started during Bakhshi Shah Mohammed's rule. However, no basic changes occurred in local administration. One group of vested interests seized power from another group of vested interests. Each chief minister enlarged this group and considered himself to be successful by getting increased central government aid to Kashmir by scare tactics of recounting the dissatisfaction felt by Kashmiri people.

This atmosphere gave Pakistan the opportunity to start anew. This appeared to be the perfect time for it to rekindle its almost-dead hope of getting Kashmir. After its defeats in the 1966 and 1971 wars with India, Pakistan knew it was useless to fight India directly. Giving the communal color to the Kashmir problem was the most effective strategy. The Kashmiri rulers had created this communal situation by building an atmosphere of distrust in the Valley, Jammu, and Laddakh. Pakistan had practiced infiltrating terrorists many times before. However, these were just scouting efforts. The serious plans to start a mock war was made during Ghulam Mohammed Shah's rule. Its widespread use was made first in 1986 in Anantnag district. Interestingly, this started in Jammu district instead of in Srinagar. A confrontation between the local people and government employees over building a mosque right in the government secretariat yard led to the case being transferred to Anantnag. This 1986 experiment proved many things.

First, a few people can be instigated over communal issues. Second, Kashmiri government and the police can be totally ineffective in such situations. Finally, this whole process can be used to create psychological terror in the minds of the whole population.

The greatest reason for increase of terrorism was the corruption and total breakdown of every government that ruled Kashmir. Obviously, Pakistan was waiting for such an opportunity to kick around the Kashmir issue at the international level. It took Pakistan many years to create this opportunity. The Pakistani claim is considered solid in other countries because Pakistan argues that the whole population of Kashmir is against India and wants to secede from it. However, it is not the real fact. Even when we leave the people in Jammu and Laddakh out, the majority of people in Kashmir do not see themselves being separated from India. For the last three years many groups consider the present situation to be appropriate. However, most of the people want to get rid of this dangerous situation. They are silent because in each locality there are two or three armed persons spying on every citizen's activities. The people know that a government belonging to these armed men cannot protect them. The local police looks the other way when it is called. The people are forced to live in this terrorist-controlled environment because they have no way to escape. They know that the government known as the Kashmiri government is not an effective organization. However, the outside world does not know all these facts. The picture that Pakistan has presented shows the whole Kashmiri population rising against India. Since Pakistan has made it an issue of Islamic brotherhood, not only are Muslim nations not hesitating in supporting India, but Western nations are also in a dilemma. It would not be surprising if the United States tries to implement its old plan in such an environment. What is wrong in presenting the Kashmir situation in a new light if it helps the United States achieve many of its goals?

Two suggestions were made recently to resolve the Kashmir issue. Both of these suggestions were made by two very important Kashmiri persons. Dr. Farooq Abdullah asks: why not consider the actual Line of Control as the border between India and Pakistan? However, Farooq Abdullah forgot here that the question is not of India's claim on the so-called Azad Kashmir.

India has not done any thing either diplomatically or militarily from its side to free Azad Kashmir from Pakistan's clutches. The problem is related to the Kashmir valley. How can it be resolved by accepting the actual Line of Control as the border? How can Pakistan accept this suggestion? If it was willing to accept it, why would it encourage terrorism in Kashmir? The former president of Kashmir, Dr. Karan Singh, wants to solve this whole problem by going back to its origin. He says that the people living in the two regions of Azad Kashmir and the three regions of Kashmir should be involved in finding a solution. Well, if we want to involve them, then what is wrong with going with the original idea of a referendum?

One aspect is always overlooked in all these proposals and suggestions that any opinion can be objective only when the people are out of the influence of terrorism. Some people suggest that terrorist groups should also be involved in these talks. This is a childish reasoning, however. If the terrorists are recognized as a group then the people cannot be considered as objective voters. The fact is that even the Indian government and political parties are not sure whether they want to keep Jammu-Kashmir in India at any cost or want to make an agreement with Pakistan. If India considers Jammu-Kashmir to have already merged with India and its continuance as important for our internal and international interests then first of all it must form and implement a long-range strategy to suppress terrorism and separate the people from the separatist elements. In the present situation, India's claim at the international level is that terrorism in Kashmir is created by some anti-social Pakistani elements and that the people of Kashmir do not support it. Until India proves that the terrorists do not represent the people of Kashmir, our diplomatic efforts cannot be successful. Removing the shadow of guns from above the people of Kashmir should be the first priority of our government.

Weakness Allowing Foreign Interference

94AS0073B Varanasi AJ in Hindi 9 Nov 93 p 6

[Article by Nikhil Chakravarty: "Kashmir: Our Policy Weakness and Foreign Interference"]

[Text] A U.S. assistant secretary issued a statement in Washington on 28 October about Kashmir and incited angry outbursts in response to it. However, if we review the whole affair keeping in mind the political consequence, we should thank Robin Raphael, and not criticize her.

What did Raphael say that should make us uncomfortable? She said that Kashmir's joining India in 1947 does not mean that Kashmir and India have become indivisible forever. No one can ignore the fact that she is repeating exactly what the U.S. officials have been telling the Indian government for a long time. In other words, she is just saying that Washington considers Jammu and Kashmir region a disputed area. John Mallot had expressed a similar opinion in Delhi publicly about six months ago. We can say that if a person declares the whole state to be disputed area, one can infer that person does not accept the said state to be part of India.

Why did Ms. Raphael share this information as a background detail with the South Asian correspondents in Washington right in the middle of the Hazratbal crisis and just before talks between India and Pakistan were to start? Political scholars and Washington experts disagree on this question. In my opinion, it would be logical to conclude that she was trying to feel how much pressure can be put on New Delhi on this issue.

There is no doubt that the aspect on which Ms. Raphael was trying to put a question mark on Kashmir's joining

India is very fine and is like splitting hairs. It is a known fact that the maharajah of Kashmir had signed the documents to join India on 27 October 1947. Lord Mountbatten, then India's governor general, had mischievously added the condition that "in states where the question of merger was disputed, the decision should be made according to the wishes of the people there." At the same time, he had also added to that document that, "as soon as the attackers are pushed back and peace is established in Kashmir, the question of merger be taken care of according to the wishes of the people."

Lord Mountbatten sold this restriction or exception to the world. The Western nations raised the question of referendum using this idea as a basis. However, Krishna Menon through his masterful speeches in the Security Council in 1957 and 1962, had destroyed the idea of holding a referendum. Krishna Menon told the Council in clear words that there was nothing disputed in that region and that India was presenting the facts to the Security Council and not a problem. Menon had also said in this context that this situation clearly indicated an armed attack against India by Pakistan against Jammu and Kashmir that had already joined India.

As for the question of people's wishes, India has always argued that the wishes of the Jammu and Kashmir people had been reflected in the organized elections held there according to the Indian Constitution. This argument has been supported by the fact that the referendum front organized by Sheikh Abdullah's followers while he was in jail was disbanded in 1975 when he became the chief minister of Kashmir.

At the international level, no question mark was placed on Kashmir's joining India in the agreement reached in Shimla between Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto and Indira Gandhi in 1972. As for the U.S. government, it has always welcomed and supported the Shimla Agreement. Thus, the question of a referendum on Kashmir was buried a long time ago. Assistant Secretary Raphael should have sensed this fact in the light of her President's speech on west Asia in the United Nations in which he had demanded repeal of the old UN resolutions.

Therefore, we should look for the political basis for Ms. Raphael's political attack on India in our own political mistakes. One thing that is clear as day is that the present government has presented a picture of total indecision. Its dealings with the United States have been extremely cowardly. Our government deliberately follows the United States in foreign policy issues even when this causes problems for us. The latest example is sending Indian troops to Somalia at the U.S. government's bidding. When President Clinton had referred to the civil war in Kashmir in the UN General Assembly, our government had not expressed any angry reaction. The government has also showed total submission in front of the IMF and the World Bank over the economic policy and systematic liberalization of our economy. The U.S. government could not contain its greed to totally control the Indian government's policy in such a situation.

In fact, we should consider Raphael's discourse as a warning. It is us who had let the Kashmir situation deteriorate so badly that other people dare to make insulting remarks to us. If we create such a situation in our own country in which there is no violation of human rights then we will not have to listen to other people's sermons. Instead of surrounding Hazratbal, we should admit that the time has come for us to listen to the terrorists' demands as is appropriate in a democratic system. We do claim to have a democracy here. If we do that then no outsider and no Raphael will have the opportunity to interfere in our affairs.

One fact about the persons who implement the U.S. foreign policy is clearly known: They do not show any finesse while dealing with sensitive issues, especially when such issues are related to people whom they consider weak. We have seen this happen repeatedly. Pandit Nehru after becoming prime minister had visited the United States in 1949 with great hope. However, he was kept at a distance even though it was his first visit to a major foreign power. Similarly, Washington had sent the Seventh Fleet as a threat when the Bangladesh crisis had reached at a decisive point. However, India was not afraid. Instead, it stood united like one person and the United States...[text illegible]

U.S. Policy Unhelpful

94AS0073C Varanasi AJ in Hindi 9 Nov 93 p 6

[Editorial: "America's Diplomacy"]

[Text] After issuing a controversial statement over Kashmir in Washington, Assistant Secretary of State and President Clinton's close associate Robin Raphael discussed the Kashmir issue with Benazir Bhutto in Islamabad. Prior to this, while talking to newsmen in Dhaka, she had said that she was going to discuss the situation in the Valley with the Pakistani leaders because this issue had increased tension between India and Pakistan. In her talks with Robin Raphael, Benazir Bhutto said that the Kashmir issue should be resolved according to the UN resolutions and the Shimla Agreement. Senior State Department officials do not consider Robin Raphael's statement to represent the U.S. policy and said while giving clarification that the U.S. policy has not changed at all. The discrepancy between the statements issued by the U.S. Department of State and the Clinton government's assistant secretary could be a part of a well-planned U.S. strategy. They are trying to attain their selfish goals in South Asia by kicking this issue around, and this could be the reason why the United States is so nice to Pakistan all of a sudden.

Soon after his taking over the government, Clinton was criticized over his strategy, and the Western political analysts had said that President Clinton procrastinates while making decisions. His order to his armed forces to attack Iraq the last time was unnecessary. It was said at that time that the President had ordered an attack on Iraq hastily in response to criticism about his habit of

delaying decisions. There are no two opinions about the fact that the United States is the sole superpower in the world after the disintegration of the Soviet Union. However, its strategy and style are pointing to the character of the "superpower" that does not encourage creativity, innovation, friendliness, and goodwill toward each other. In any part of the world where the Clinton administration has interfered, the problem has not been solved but conflict and disorder were increased. This has put question marks on his policies. Today, one of his secretaries has started a controversy by issuing a statement about India's integral member, Kashmir. There are hints of nuclear war in South Asia, and fear is being expressed that this war would be caused because of Kashmir. The United States and other Western nations air this opinion to aggravate the situation because of their own vested interests. India's stand on Kashmir is very clear and that of Pakistan is very unclear. It is not interested in a peaceful resolution to the Kashmir problem. It always tries to cause instability in India and uses various strategies to this end. Western nations use Pakistan as a pawn and encourage it. If there is a war between India and Pakistan over Kashmir, the people who issue meaningless and controversial statements will also be held responsible for it.

Why this sudden change in U.S. policy toward the Pakistan to which it had stopped economic and military aid in 1990 because Pakistan was attaining nuclear capability and ignoring international laws related to it and had warned that the United States was going to include it in the terrorist nations list for encouraging terrorism in its neighbor India? In this context, Foreign Minister Dinesh Singh's statement seems to be correct to the last word. According to him the United States has started to throw around the Kashmir issue in order to increase its trade and to make the Islamic nations happy by making statements that Pakistan likes to hear. Not only this, the United States does not want India and other South Asian nations to become independent in their defense and development plans. It is using Kashmir to assert pressure and wants to force India to sign the NPT [Nonproliferation Treaty]. However, this effort could prove costly for the United States. It should keep in mind that Russia, Britain, Israel and other nations have reacted to the controversial statements over Kashmir issued by the United States, have reaffirmed their stands, accepted Kashmir as an integral part of India, and have advised the resolution of this issue according to the Shimla Agreement. In such a situation, the United States cannot succeed in forcing India to act according to its wishes by issuing meaningless statements. The United States is expected as a "superpower" to adopt a balanced policy on critical issues and give wise guidance for their resolution. We expect Pakistan not to be fooled by anyone and risk itself.

Crisis Deepening

94AS0073D Varanasi AJ in Hindi 4 Nov 93 p 6

[Editorial: "Kashmir's Deepening Crisis"]

[Text] The acting U.S. ambassador, Kenneth Bill, met twice with Foreign Secretary J.N. Dixit and Joint Secretary Hardip Patel, Foreign Ministry's expert on American affairs. He advised them of the Clinton administration's stand on Kashmir, and tried to calm the explosive situation created by the statements issued by their Assistant Secretary of State Robin Raphael. However, the same Robin Raphael repeated her statement in Dhaka and further aggravated the situation. She said that even though then Kashmir's maharajah had signed documents in 1947 agreeing to merge Kashmir with India, it does not mean that Kashmir has become a part of India for good. The U.S. administration has tried to counter the strong reaction to this statement about Kashmir by saying that it believes in India's regional unity and respects its right to self-determination. The Clinton administration has created a very complex and difficult situation by dropping the old policy on Kashmir. At a time when terrorists have given a serious challenge to India by seizing innocent citizens in Hazratbal, such Kashmir-related statements by a responsible U.S. official in Washington and South Asian countries is analogous to pouring oil on fire.

By not publicizing the clarification given by Clinton administration, the foreign ministry has made the situation even more complicated and uncertain. If this clarification is still being analyzed, then it is natural to suspect that the U.S. stand on Kashmir is not clear and the clarification is not to the point. In such a situation, the Indian government should demonstrate its tenacity and inform the United States about the whole situation and let it know through diplomatic channel what is being done in Kashmir which is an integral part of India. Adopting a vague stand on such an important issue could prove dangerous for India. In addition to communicating through its diplomatic missions, India should depute a special envoy to the United States and other countries to take them in confidence over the Kashmir issue. The Rao government should remember that in 1971 when the burden of hundreds of thousands of East Pakistani (now Bangladeshi) refugees had increased and Pakistan was levying false accusations against us, then Prime Minister Indira Gandhi had alerted Indian foreign missions and had also sent Jaya Prakash Narayan as a special envoy to major countries in the world. She was able to get their support for India. India must initiate similar diplomatic efforts today because of the issues raised.

U.S., Pakistan Aggravating Situation

94AS0073E Varanasi AJ in Hindi 4 Nov 93 p 6

[Article by Dr Baldevraj Gupta: "Kashmir Problem: An American Hand on Pakistan's Back"]

[Text] Washington is the most active critic of India at the international level. Recently, Robin Raphael's statement on Kashmir that "the United States does not recognize Kashmir's merger with India in 1947" has angered the Indian people and has made Pakistanis express joy at the

U.S. statement. By interfering in India's internal affairs following a well-planned strategy, the United States has shown its support for Pakistan. During the Cold War, Pakistan had made many unsuccessful attempts to raise the Kashmir issue at the United Nations. This time around, Pakistan has the blessings of the United States using the pretense of protecting human rights.

We Had To Bow Down

Our foreign policy has been substandard for the last four or five years and its graph of performance is still falling downward. We have been especially shocked on three fronts. We have had to bow down to pressure in connection with nuclear weapons, human rights, and trade deals. Our influence in neutral countries has been neutralized because of our falling esteem. Our foreign ministry is also suffering from internal strife.

Only Three Words

Nehru's dream of non-aligned countries movement has become just three words. The United States always disliked this effort and now the Commonwealth of Nations has become just a 'club' of few nations. All it entails is fancy feasts, recreation, travel, cricket matches, and a personal photo session with the Queen of England. Once this group was so important that Nehru and Indira Gandhi used to give up all their important work to participate in it. Important diplomatic relationships were established at the prime minister's level. At present, India is represented to the Commonwealth by our non-political Finance Minister Dr. Manmohan Singh and Secretary J.N. Dixit. This shows India's seriousness about the Commonwealth of Nations.

Foreign Ministry

The number of nations that are friendly to India is gradually decreasing. Prime Minister Narasimha Rao's trips to China and Iran have proved that Mr. Rao is a competent foreign minister even though he is not an effective prime minister. I do not want to undermine Dinesh Singh by making this statement, however, we have to admit that illness has made him ineffective. His production has decreased and the [personnel in] the foreign ministry are doing whatever they want. An economic daily has openly written that the foreign ministry is trying to recommend a person with connection to the Mafia in Gulf countries as an ambassador. This is a major conspiracy to smuggle money and weapons to India. The infighting just like within the Congress (I) Party is prevalent in the foreign ministry also.

Mrs. Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi used to keep a sharp eye on the foreign ministry and many countries were India's friends at that time. They helped us through thick and thin and trusted us. Our foreign relations have been deteriorating since V.P. Singh's time. Chandra Shekhar was a caretaker prime minister. He did make some efforts, however, the image did not improve. Mr. Rao made economic issues as the top priority and adopted the Manmohan Singh formula for improving

the economy. Only minimal attention was given to foreign policy. As a result, even Russia is upset with us.

Lack of Seriousness

India did not have any serious discussion about foreign affairs either in the Parliament, or in the cabinet, or at party level. The communist countries began to fall one after another after the Soviet Union disintegrated, and this course is still in effect. We remained standing as spectators. The United States disintegrated the second bloc and changed from a superpower to the 'supreme power.' The role of number two ended and it has disappeared from the map. We, the third world countries, became third class nations. These days, there are hordes of number three and number four type of nations. There is no number two. Number one has become the 'A-one.' The United States will not let any country become number two now. It can attack a nation just to teach one person (Saddam Hussein) a lesson. It can threaten the whole world. It can deploy thousands of soldiers in Somalia to let the world know it is the United States of America. Tomorrow, it can send armed forces to Kashmir through the United Nations as a pretext to defend human rights! Will our Parliament remain silent even then?

Excuse of Human Rights

Under what pressure was a human rights ordinance was issued so suddenly in India? Even the army has been encompassed within it. Meat and bread is being sent to the terrorists occupying the Hazratbal mosque at the orders of Jammu-Kashmir High Court. This order has been challenged in India's Supreme Court. Pakistan wants to raise the Kashmir issue at international level (UNO) through the Islamic nations organization. Most of the Muslim nations support Pakistan and the United States also has its hand on Pakistan's back. The United Nations, which depends on the United States for economic support, will become active whenever a hint is given to it.

Slogans asking Indian armed forces to go back and "we want freedom" are being raised by the separatists with encouragement by Pakistan. The Indian army, which had forced General Niazi and Pakistan's huge armed forces to surrender, is sitting helplessly in front of the 50-60 terrorists sitting in Hazratbal. India does not want the United Nations to get involved there by using the human rights angle. The Pakistan-trained terrorists would surrender if the United States asks them, however, this means that the United States is supporting terrorism. This is very strange and a part of its strategy. First the United States said that it did not recognize Kashmir's merger into India. Now it is waiting for the reaction. Later, it will say that Kashmir is a disputed region. The third step would be using human rights as an excuse to send UN armed forces to Kashmir. The fourth step would be U.S. supremacy over Kashmir so that it can keep diplomatic eye on India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, and China. This is a conspiracy to keep an eye on Asia

through Kashmir. The United States is using Pakistan as a front to keep Kashmir separate from India because of its military and geographic importance.

The United States used the human rights as an excuse to break up many countries including the Soviet Union. This subterfuge will be used again involving Kashmir to control India, and Tibet to control China. The U.S. human rights strategy can function as a 'human bomb' in many countries. What kind of human rights war is the United States fighting by protecting terrorists? The future history will remember these actions as 'supreme hooliganism'.

Reason Behind Silence

The Indian intelligence agencies have concluded that among the four diplomats that were expelled from Pakistani missions, one second secretary Sanaullah had relations with Pakistan intelligence agency ISI and the terrorists involved in Hazratbal. He was active there since 25 February 1993. His wife, Mrs. Fauzi Sanaullah, is an advisor to the top level Pakistani official Riaz Khokhar. The other expelled person Sahebzada Ahmed Khan was the assistant commissioner in Pakistani High Commission in Bombay. He used movie star Anima Ayub to spy for Pakistan in Bombay. The Pakistani spies were involved in many bomb blasts and placing bombs in trains. This actress had also worked in a Devanand movie.

Pakistan is openly interfering in Kashmir. Umar Farooq, the teenager leader of the Kul Jamaat Hariat Conference, is the son of Umar Farooq Mirbaz who was assassinated in 1990. He is involved in inciting the youth and spreading terrorism. The United States is indirectly helping Umar. He is very interested in Hazratbal. The separatist forces there are getting a lot of strength from this event.

India's internal security minister, Rajesh Pilot, is silent about Kashmir. Mr. Rao had advised Mr. Pilot to remain silent in the 16 October cabinet meeting. Why? The terrorists hiding in Hazratbal mosque have offered to use Dr. Karan Singh as the mediator, and this step could resolve the Kashmir issue permanently.

Benazir Wants To Become Another Indira

Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto who has returned to power again has always given provoking speeches about Kashmir. She says, "Pakistan will not only help Kashmiri people morally, but also will offer help at military and diplomatic levels."

Benazir expresses regret, "Unfortunately, the Kashmir issue was neglected during President Ziaul Haq's time; it was put in cold storage." "I activated the Kashmir issue as soon as I took power. I told Rajiv Gandhi that the Kashmir issue has been there since the partition." Benazir added that Rajiv also recognized Kashmir as a

problem. She continues in exactly the U.S. tone, "Terrorism is not solution to the Kashmir issue, however, the struggle must be continued for some results."

One Pakistani journalist believes that the Pakistani leaders do not care whether Kashmir joins Pakistan or not. They want to make sure that it is separated from India. This will make Pakistani people, especially Benazir, feel vindicated for breaking up Bangladesh. She would be called the Indira Gandhi of Pakistan and, at the same time, the stigma on her father for losing a part of the country will also be wiped away.

Kashmir, an Integral Part

All Indian political parties and Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao have clearly stated that Kashmir is, and will remain, an integral part of India. They will not let any Pakistani trick succeed. On 27 October 1947, Hari Singh, then Kashmir's maharajah, had merged Kashmir to India just like other maharajahs had done. Former Kashmir President Dr. Karan Singh had said openly that Kashmir's merger with India is historically, legally, and constitutionally appropriate. The signed documents related to merger are safe with India. The people of Jammu-Kashmir were given right by their vidhan sabha in 1952 to elect their own government. This way, internal autonomy was given to the people of the state. A part of Kashmir was occupied by Pakistan and Maharajah Hari Singh had complained to Lord Mountbatten in writing about it. Later this problem was raised in the United Nations. The United Nations had instructed Pakistan to leave the area it had occupied immediately. This problem is still there even today and India will have to have it vacated with UN help. All this reminds me a line written by my poet friend Khan Ghazi Kabuli which he had recited in Indira Gandhi's presence: "Kashmir is ours, the whole lot of it."

Constitutional Crisis

94.1S0073F Varanasi AJ in Hindi 1 Nov 93 p 6

[Editorial: "Kashmir's Constitutional Crisis"]

[Text] India's Foreign Minister Dinesh Singh has condemned the U.S. government statement over Kashmir, and said that India will not tolerate any outside interference. He called this effort to put a question mark on Kashmir's being an integral part of India unmistakable interference. No country has the right to interfere in India's internal affairs. The way the United States is interfering in various countries' internal affairs is a cause for concern. Its efforts to sincerely implement peace are praiseworthy, however, when it tries to take advantage by having two nations clash, this is condemnable. The Cold War is considered to have ended when the Soviet Union disintegrated, however, it is still following the policy of interfering in various nations' internal affairs. It is not difficult to understand the reason for its "digging up the old corpse of Kashmir" at a time when India-Pakistan relations are going through a critical period. India had friendly relations with the Soviet Union. The

United States did not like this at all. The United States was worried by the Soviet armed forces presence in Afghanistan. It provided Pakistan a huge quantity of weapons to help remove the Soviet troops. Now Pakistan is giving those same weapons to Afghan rebels and sending them to Kashmir as terrorists. It is not possible that the U.S. government is not aware of it. Many such Afghan rebels were arrested in Kashmir. Similarly, the U.S. weapons given to Pakistan are being used by the terrorists in Kashmir for murder, destruction, and for spreading anarchy. It just is not believable that the United States is not aware of these facts.

In this context, the Kashmir-related comments made by U.S. officials cannot be called incidental. All this has emerged as a well-planned international conspiracy. The United States has no right to question Jammu-Kashmir's merger into the Indian Union. The historic facts cannot be changed because of U.S. agreement or disagreement with those. Questioning the legitimacy of the British Parliament's legislation that made India four decades after the fact is an unique example of U.S. "wisdom." Suspecting historic legislative facts is totally inappropriate and nonsense. It is not possible for anyone to turn the clock back. India had complained against Pakistani attacks on Kashmir in the Security Council. In the long debate that ensued in the Council, Pakistan was not declared an aggressor even though it was because of the U.S. clustering efforts. India did not get the justice it had hoped for when it had raised this question. Still, if we review the whole debate that took place in the Security Council, it would be proved that India had presented reliable proof of Pakistani aggression. The resolution passed in the Security Council about Kashmir had the clause that the referendum would be taken only after Pakistan has removed its troops from the occupied areas. The referendum could not be held because Pakistan has never removed its troops from occupied Kashmir. Pakistan has openly defied the United Nations by not evacuating that region even now. In such a situation, the U.S. government's calling Kashmir a disputed area is totally inappropriate and meaningless.

If the United States does not recognize the Indian Independence Act passed by the British Parliament then it makes even Pakistan's creation unconstitutional. The fact is that the basis of Pakistan's creation is this British act. The Pakistan that was created by dividing India did not have Kashmir as part of it. Kashmir was always an integral part of India. Pakistan took control of part of the state after the barbarous attack that it initiated through the tribals in 1947, however, it was badly defeated in Kashmir valley. In 1965 again, Pakistan used the U.S.-made Patton tanks and Saber jets in a deceptive attack on Kashmir. The skilled Indian soldiers destroyed the tanks and the planes. The Clinton administration should carefully review the role of its predecessors in these events. The way the United States has helped Pakistan in relation to Kashmir is not a secret. A State Department official while clarifying the statement made by one of its representatives said that "there has been no change in

the U.S. policy toward India and it respects India's integrity as a nation." He also supported the holding of talks between India and Pakistan according to the Shimla Agreement. However, the United States has created a very explosive situation in the Indian subcontinent by calling Kashmir a disputed region. The terrorism that Pakistan has spread in Kashmir is equivalent to an open war against India. The way the Pakistan-trained terrorists have established themselves with all the dangerous weapons in Hazratbal has caused this situation to become very serious. The patience and control that India has demonstrated during this time is commendable. Pakistan's Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto should appeal to the terrorists to come out instead of asking that the security forces should remove their siege. As for Kashmir, it is an integral part of India and no power can separate it from our country.

Government's Kashmir Policy Seen Inept, Failing

*94P50039A Calcutta ANANDA BAZAR PATRIKA
in Bengali 13 Nov p 4*

[Article by Sunit Ghosh: 'The Indian Government's Fraudulent Policy in Relation to Kashmir Has Not Solved the Crisis']

[Text] Tell me, at this moment, who in this country is understood as VIPs? I know you will think of a lot of names like Shankar Dayal Sharma, Narasimha Rao, Sonia Gandhi. Some will think of Kalpanath Ray, or even Priyanka Gandhi. But if I had to answer this question, without hesitation, I would point to the militants in the Hazratbal Shrine as the true VIPs. For nearly a month, they have been using this masjid as a weapon. Everyday, the government sends them nutritious food and the military is responsible for their security. A number of journalists are on hand to spread their message. What better treatment could they possibly receive? Without spending a penny, these militants are getting the Kashmir problem aired before a world audience. India's 'secularist' intellectuals do not deem it necessary to speak out against these anti-Indian militants who have defiled a masjid. Leftists who shed tears over the Babri masjid-mandir destruction are silent over Hazratbal. A couple of Muslim leaders have timidly mumbled a few words of protest but this has had no effect on the body of Muslims. Kashmiri Muslim leaders have taken the position that the militants have committed no outrage by entering the masjid with arms. They were more interested in whether or not Mohammad's hair was still in place and made a trip there to ascertain this. They blame the government for obstructing their mission. They want the military to stop their encirclement and allow the militants to flee. [passage omitted]

India's claim that Kashmir is an inseparable part of the country has become very weak. If Kashmir is merely an internal matter of the country, why are authorities so hesitant in taking measures against the militants? Indira Gandhi did not hesitate in taking extreme measures to flush out the terrorists from the Golden Temple. Uttar

Pradesh's Mulayam Singh's government did not hesitate to shower Kar Sevaks with bullets. Yet a few militants have now brought the powerful Indian government to its knees! Pakistan is overjoyed, naturally. Benazir Bhutto, right from the time she returned to power, has seized upon the Narasimha Rao Government's weakness and is setting the conditions for dialogue with India. With their backs to the wall, the government keeps up their shrill claim that Pakistan has no right to talk about Kashmir. [passage omitted]

Congress (I) has always feared integration of Kashmir into the nation and since Nehru, have made an effort to keep it a place apart. Only under the government of Morarji Desai in 1977 did Kashmir have a real election. The results were not bad. The winner, Sheikh Abdullah, did a commendable job in handling the administration of the state. The rest is history.

On the one hand, Kashmir is deprived, year after year, of its own democratic representation. On the other hand, because of constitutional article 370, giving Kashmiris their own autonomy and separate identity, Kashmir has been a fertile ground in which separatist sentiment has thrived. Now 99

of Kashmiri Muslims are anti-Indian. Perhaps Farooq Abdullah is the only exception. Now, however, the London residing Abdullah is irrelevant. Years ago, he was considered the only hope.

The constitutional amendment on Kashmir has removed the 'Secular' rationale from the state, highlighting its Islamic character. The state has simply not been integrated into the nation. Indian 'secularism' will be imperiled if Kashmir goes separate. It is natural for those in the majority community to demand self-control in this environment. The Indian government has supported Palestinian and Tamil terrorist. Why should it be so unnatural for them to accept Pakistan-supported terrorism in Kashmir? Our diplomacy is primarily based on deception. The Kashmir policy suffers the most from this deception.

This deception is the reason we cannot find a solution in Kashmir. On the one hand, we hear that Kashmir is an inseparable part of India. On the other, that the state must maintain separate institutions and identity. This incites separatism. By crushing the separatism, anti-Indian feeling increases. The Indian government alone is responsible for this reprehensible situation.

The only way out of this situation is acceptance. In reality, this has already happened. One part of Kashmir is under Indian rule, one part under Pakistani authority. The line of control is the boundary between two nations. Maybe a recognition of this, guided by the Shimla agreement is still possible.

White House Urged To Take 'a Different View' on Kashmir

BK1911123793 Delhi All India Radio General Overseas Service in English 1010 GMT 19 Nov

[Commentary by S.K. Nayyar: "Lessons of Hazratbal Episode"]

[Text] The surrender of the militants holed up in the Hazratbal shrine has significant implications, both international and domestic. Despite tremendous pressure, both within and outside, the authorities stuck to the strategy of flushing out the ultras without recourse to force. They have finally won, and this is a truly remarkable victory for both time and patience.

The 35 civilians who were kept hostages by the militants have been united with their families after screening. The screening of the remaining 30 people is on to identify those with criminal records as well those who infiltrated from across the border or LOC [Line of Control] as agents of ISI [Inter Service Intelligence] to foment trouble in the valley and will be dealt with according to the law of the land.

The incident of Hazratbal highlights a few things that are important for us to draw lessons [from]. The extremist organizations are divided with none having a clear aim as to what it wants. The infighting among the insurgents prove this point. The discovery of 24 detonators and connecting with wires the four minarets of the shrine and a 4-kg cylinder tied to each of them proved the apprehension of the forces that even the slightest use of force would have given militants a chance to blow [up] the shrine from inside and later blame the security forces. The tunnels linking the room underground and the discovery of infantry weapons, including 16 AK series rifles, a sniper rifle, rocket launcher, communication equipment, hand grenades, mines and ammunition proved beyond doubt that the religious places, educational institutions, and other such sacred places are being misused as hideouts and launching pads for extremist activities. The presence of foreigners in the shrine also proved the involvement of ISI and foreign mercenaries in fomenting trouble inside the valley.

Now that the impasse has ended without the security forces entering the mosque, New Delhi is in a stronger position on the Kashmir issue, and the people who matter in the White House, therefore, have to take a different view of the dispute. The presence of Pakistanis inside the shrine is a serious setback to Islamabad in the light of its stand that it would not hold talks till the Hazratbal crisis is solved to its satisfaction. Good diplomacy warrants India to bring home to White House and Capitol Hill the wrongs that Pakistan has been doing to the people of India by implanting insurgency in various parts of the country.

With the surrender, the Kashmir problem is not solved. It may be too early to suggest starting of a political process now. But it is time we must strengthen the

political parties and the local groups to persuade militants to shed violence and have faith in the Indian Constitution and have their grievances, if any, redressed. Even militants of the organizations who have faith in the Indian Constitution should be encouraged to take part in the discussion which will help emerge new leadership to lead the state.

Since the people by and large are fed up with hartals [strikes] and violence, they should be cultivated to alienate insurgents and their help in the restoration of law and order and proper governance should be enlisted. The borders will have to be sealed to ensure end of infiltration, and if need be, the infiltrators should be chased right inside the Pakistani territory and effectively. If anything India can discuss with Pakistan, it is a surrender of the Pakistan-occupied territory and the method through which Pakistan would end insurgency across the border.

Hazratbal Occupation's Impact on Kashmir Analyzed

*94AS0074C Bombay NAVBHARAT TIMES in Hindi
22 Nov 93 p 4*

[Article by Ramsevak Shrivastav: "Kashmir After Hazratbal"]

[Text] An English daily published from the capital has printed an interesting and meaningful cartoon in response to the terrorists' submission and the Supreme Court's order related to the Election Commission. Two huge figures are drawn. One character's mouth is shown closed as if his mouth was stuffed with sweet balls. The mouth of the other figure was so wide open that his teeth, tongue and throat was clearly visible. The title was: "Both on top."

It is not necessary to tell here that the caricature with its mouth shut was of Prime Minister Narasimha Rao and the one with mouth open was of Election Commissioner T.N. Sheshan. Mr. Rao who took credit for submission by the terrorists without any bloodshed or fighting appeared bowed like a tree laden with fruit. The Supreme Court had decided on the Commission case that the decision of the election commissioner on any election issue will be final and binding. He can ask advice from other commissioners, Mahendar Singh Gill and G.V. Karishnamurthy, but he will not be required to accept it.

The patience and courage that our nation's leadership demonstrated in the Hazratbal incident produced good results. This not only foiled the Pakistani and ISI conspiracy to push the Valley into the fire like they did in 1963, but also let some Muslim nations know that India does not have evil designs. Bangladesh condemned the political use of a religious shrine. Iran praised India's tolerance. The statements issued by Ms. Raphael of the United States (assistant secretary) were treated as her

personal opinion and the Shimla Agreement was considered to be the way to go. We have to admit that India was praised at the international level.

The problem is that the BJP does not trust the good intentions imbedded in Mr. Narasimha Rao's decision. It was announced that the persons coming out of the shrine were released after preliminary questioning. The terrorists, however, will be tried according to the laws. The only special treatment was that they were not given into the custody of the military or para-military authorities.

Mr. Lal Advani, the BJP president, considers the Hazratbal action to be a major blunder. He says that the weakness of our government has internationalized the Kashmir issue. Mr. Advani demands that the agreement made between the government and the terrorists must be made public through a 'white paper.' The details of the incidents that preceded the submission, names of the terrorists, and the listing of the confiscated weapons must be published so that the people are aware of all the particulars. The government has bowed down to the terrorists by accepting their demand to be handed over to the Jammu-Kashmir police. The BJP is especially pained by the fact that the Pakistan-trained terrorists were fed biriyani [rich rice dish] by the Indian army. Meanwhile, water hoses were let loose on the BJP volunteers demonstrating in Delhi on 25 February in 1993. The patriots were badly treated here. The question raised is: The Hazratbal crisis has been averted but what is the proof that the hearts of the terrorists have changed? Have the people in Kashmir changed because of the Indian government's stand? This problem must be solved by political means. The home minister says that a courageous initiative is necessary. How will that initiative be taken and what will it entail?

Paper Notes OIC 'Lack of Support' for Pakistan Move

*BK0112023493 Delhi INDIAN EXPRESS in English
25 Nov 93 p 8*

[Editorial: "OIC Changes Tack"]

[Text] It would be rash to regard the withdrawal of the Pakistani move to raise the Kashmir issue in a UN committee as a sign of a less truculent policy of the Benazir Bhutto government towards India. The decision not to go ahead with the proposal was announced at a meeting of the group of the member-countries of the Organisation of Islamic Conference [OIC] at the UN headquarters in New York. And it was announced to these members by Saudi Arabia and Pakistan. After all, the OIC has allowed Pakistan to misuse its platform to carry on an anti-India tirade all these years and has done so with the active support particularly of Saudi Arabia. It is far from clear whether Pakistan or Saudi Arabia took the initiative in the present shift and why. What is clear, however, is that the announcement was greeted with relief at the meeting. What this means is that many OIC

members might have had second thoughts about the advisability of allowing Pakistan to repeat the mischief in the UN at this time. Such a dubious way of Pakistan conducting foreign policy may appear to be very clever and even to pay dividends in domestic politics. But others in the OIC have perhaps begun to resent being taken by Pakistan for granted. Many of the hitherto silent members of the OIC did not favour the Pakistani bid to move a resolution in the UN to raise a hue and cry over alleged human rights violations in Kashmir and to call for a fact-finding mission to be sent there.

From the point of view of most members of the OIC, a proposal of this kind, even if it did not make headway in a UN committee, would have been a bad precedent. How many Islamic countries, for instance, can boast of even rudimentary representative institutions and can claim that they do not indulge in large-scale human rights violations? Can it be denied that there is a much better case for fact-finding missions to most of these countries where repression is routine? It is possible that inconvenient questions like these persuaded quite a few OIC members that discretion is the better part of valour and conveyed their feeling to Saudi Arabia and Pakistan.

Above all, the Hazratbal episode might well have made an impact on many Islamic countries wholly different from what Pakistan had wished and had even conspired to produce. The grim determination with which the Indian security forces eventually compelled the Pakistani-sponsored terrorists inside the holy shrine to surrender but refrained from firing a single shot in the 32 days of the tense standoff was noted throughout the world. OIC members could not but be reminded uncomfortably of instances of armed assaults on rebels hiding in mosques in Saudi Arabia and some other Islamic countries. Even if Islamabad has dropped its latest anti-India move because of lack of support in OIC, the retreat may help create a better climate for a dialogue with New Delhi.

U.S. Position on Kashmir Questioned

94AS0074A New Delhi JANSATTA in Hindi 25 Nov 93
p 4

[Editorial: "America's Game"]

[Text] Even though U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher has praised India in a letter to Prime Minister Narasimha Rao for resolving the Hazratbal situation peacefully, his letter does not indicate whether there is any change in the anti-India policy of the United States. The instigatory statements issued by Robin Raphael have created serious concerns regarding U.S. policy. Afterwards, in order to reduce India's protests, a senior State Department official told the Indian ambassador that there has been no change in the U.S. policy on India. He also agreed that the Shimla Agreement could be the best way to resolve the Kashmir problem. The Indian government had considered this clarification a positive step. However, neither the assistant secretary

nor the secretary of state have voided Raphael's statements. Instead, Christopher's letter while expressing pleasure at the Hazratbal action has also pointed toward the Clinton administration's suggestions that have created concerns in India. For example, Christopher has repeated his offer to help India for resolving the 'prevailing issues' and 'keeping in mind all the groups' without directly mentioning the Shimla Agreement. The United States has been trying to force this 'third option' on India for a long time.

True, the U.S. officials also have said that the United States does not want to force a solution on India. If India and Pakistan so desire "the United States is willing to help." This diplomatic language indicates that the United States wants to take a friendly initiative. In fact, the United States has been working on a diplomatic solution to force India to agree with it. Robin Raphael's statement was one such action. The United States tried to blame India instead of Pakistan for the Hazratbal incident. Instead of condemning Pakistan for inciting the Kashmir people and encouraging the terrorists, it continued to advise India to be patient. Christopher's letter was silent on the causes of Hazratbal incident and just congratulated India on removing the military blockade. For the United States, the issue was not occupation of the shrine by the terrorists, but its siege by the Indian military. In such an atmosphere, it is natural to suspect that the Indian government decided to follow the policy of leniency toward the terrorists under the U.S. government pressure. The United States had created a difficult situation for the Indian government. The Indian government could not risk the U.S. disapproval by taking strict action against the terrorists, exposing the Pakistani conspiracy, and establishing its control in the Valley. Pakistan had threatened to raise the Kashmir issue in the United Nations under his anti-India propaganda plan. It appears that the United States was successful in making Pakistan to change its plans. It is clear that by playing this role between the two countries, the United States is preparing itself for the role of the mediator later. The Indian government is facing this difficult question of whether or not it will accept U.S. government's mediation, and if so, the U.S. suggestion of a third option?

British Position on Kashmir Seen More Favorable Than U.S.

94AS0074B New Delhi JANSATTA in Hindi 22 Nov 93
p 4

[Article: "British Position on Kashmir More Positive—Singhvi"]

[Text] New Delhi, 25 November—The United States and Great Britain have different stands on Kashmir, and the U.K. position is very positive. The United Kingdom believes that Pakistan has complicated the Kashmir issue by spreading terrorism in the Valley.

Dr. Laxmimal Singhvi, Indian high commissioner in Britain, told JANSATTA in an interview that Douglas Heard, the British foreign minister, must have understood this fact during his recent trip to India. He had visited India recently to fulfill the final formality of cooperative agreement between India and Britain. This support will greatly help India in fighting terrorism. The Indian government can ask for extradition of terrorists and smugglers that are hiding in Britain for court trial here. This will put an end to their favorite hiding place.

Dr. Singhvi considers Mr. Douglas Heard's reaction to Assistant Secretary Raphael's statement a diplomatic success. He said that he was glad to see the United Kingdom had not supported the United States on this issue. Heard had said that Raphael's comment was unnecessary and out of context. The U.S. assistant secretary had raised the question over Kashmir's merger in which the question of Kashmir's merger into India is raised. Mr. Heard conceded that just accepting the idea of merger does not solve the Kashmir problem.

According to Dr. Singhvi, there are three aspects of the British stand on Kashmir. [First is that] India and Pakistan should resolve it through mutual talks. He said that India had always considered the Shimla Agreement to be the basis for bilateral relations. Pakistan had been violating this agreement. Dr. Singhvi said that the British government appeared to be agreeing with the Indian position. The second part is related to human rights. Pakistan is telling the whole world that human

rights are threatened in Kashmir. Britain was not fooled by this propaganda. It believes that India is being tolerant in Kashmir. Pakistan's actions are provoking in nature. Still, the military and para-military forces are doing their duty. If they went to extremes, the Indian government did not try to cover it up.

Dr. Singhvi also said that Britain wants the Indian government to permit international human rights organizations to visit Kashmir. According to Britain this openness will help increase India's prestige and the propaganda against India will lose its momentum. The British government also believes that the Indian government must make special efforts to establish peace and democratic process in the Valley. This is considered the third aspect of the British position. According to Dr. Singhvi, citizens of Pakistan-occupied Kashmir and those of Pakistan are campaigning on their own. This has influenced some regions there. Even Parliament Members are influenced by it. Still, the British government, Labour Party, and the Liberal Party all believe that democracy, human rights, and secularism have deep roots in India.

He said that the way Pakistan is raising the Kashmir issue everywhere shows that it has only one arrow left in its quiver. It raises the Kashmir issue sometimes as a religious issue, other times as a issue of self-determination and still other times as a human rights issue. The world has begun to understand its maneuver. We can expect pressure to resolve this issue by bilateral talks.

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT NO. 352
MERRIFIELD, VA.

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, military, economic, environmental, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available sources. It should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed. Except for excluding certain diacritics, FBIS renders personal names and place-names in accordance with the romanization systems approved for U.S. Government publications by the U.S. Board of Geographic Names.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes: China, East Europe, Central Eurasia, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically.

Current DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be

provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

22 JAN 94